

firings of both the ascent and descent propulsion systems.

The unmanned lunar module was boosted into Earth orbit by a Saturn IB. Post-flight analysis determined the lunar module ready for manned Earth orbital missions.

During 1968, Scientist-Astronauts John A. Llewellyn and Brian T. O'Leary withdrew from the training program, Air Force Lt. Col. Michael Collins underwent surgery for removal of an arthritic bone growth, and Navy Lt. John S. Bull withdrew due to pulmonary disease. Astronaut James A. Lovell, Jr. replaced Collins in the Apollo 8 crew as command module pilot. The original Apollo 8 crew was redesignated for the Apollo 9 mission when the lunar module was deleted from Apollo 8.

AERONAUTICS

Among the continuing research and development projects in aeronautics are noise abatement, flight safety, the materials, propulsion and flight dynamics of supersonic and hypersonic aircraft, lifting bodies and Vertical Short Takeoff and Landing (VSTOL) craft.

ADVANCED RESEARCH

NASA scientists and engineers, working with university and industry groups, pushed ahead in the fields of space power, electric, nuclear and chemical propulsion to enhance

the capability of already-proven launch vehicles.

TECHNOLOGY UTILIZATION

NASA continued to transfer to industry, small business and the scientific community the new technology coming out of space-related research and development activity. Most of this technology comes from NASA field centers where specialists continuously review research and development projects for promising new ideas. In addition, NASA contractors are required to report inventions, discoveries, innovations and improved techniques they develop in work for NASA.

TRACKING NETS

Three basic tracking networks keep tabs on NASA's orbiting satellites: Manned Space Flight Network (MSFN), Deep Space Network (DSN) and the Space Tracking and Data Acquisition Network (STADAN).

There are 26 sites in the three networks, some single, some of multiple purpose, located in 15 countries around the world. Each network is designed to support specific types of missions, depending on whether it is near Earth, manned or probing deep space.

These networks are constantly being strengthened to handle the demands of the newer and increasingly sophisticated satel-

lites. In 1969, NASA plans to add a 210-foot-diameter antenna in Spain and in Australia to beef up the DSN for future missions into deep space.

The 210's provide six-and-a-half times increased performance over existing 85-foot antennas, making it possible to return useful scientific data from three and one-half billion miles from Earth.

NASA MAJOR LAUNCH RECORD, OCTOBER 1959 TO DECEMBER 1968

| Year | Number of launches | Vehicle results | | Mission results | |
|---------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------|-----------------|---------|
| | | Success | Failure | Success | Failure |
| 1958 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| 1959 | 14 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 6 |
| 1960 | 17 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 8 |
| 1961 | 23 | 16 | 7 | 15 | 8 |
| 1962 | 27 | 23 | 4 | 20 | 7 |
| 1963 | 13 | 12 | 1 | 11 | 2 |
| 1964 | 30 | 26 | 4 | 25 | 5 |
| 1965 | 31 | 27 | 4 | 26 | 5 |
| 1966 | 36 | 33 | 3 | 26 | 10 |
| 1967 | 27 | 25 | 2 | 25 | 2 |
| 1968 | 21 | 16 | 5 | 17 | 4 |
| 10-year total | 243 | 196 | 45 | 182 | 60 |

¹ Figures do not include "unrated" items.

² Includes 2 satellites launched on 1 vehicle.

MAJOR NASA LAUNCHES, 1968

| Date | Name | Launch vehicle | Launch site | Mission | Results | |
|------------|------------------|----------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|---------|-----------------------|
| | | | | | Vehicle | Mission |
| January 7 | Surveyor VII | Atlas-Centaur | KSC | Lunar photos; lunar surface analyses. | Success | Success. |
| January 11 | Explorer XXXVI | Delta | WTR | Geodesy | do | Do. |
| January 22 | Apollo 5 | Saturn IB | KSC | Lunar module test | do | Do. |
| March 4 | OGO-V | Atlas-Agena | KSC | Earth-Sun data | do | Do. |
| March 5 | Explorer XXXVII | Scout | WI | Solar radiation | do | Do. |
| April 4 | Apollo 6 | Saturn V | KSC | Launch vehicle test | Unrated | Unrated. |
| May 16 | ESRO-II-B | Scout | WTR | Radiation investigation | Success | Success. ¹ |
| May 18 | Explorer XXXVIII | TAT-Agena | WTR | Meteorology | Failure | Failure. |
| July 4 | Explorer XXXIX | Delta | WTR | Radiospectrometry | Success | Success. |
| July 8 | Explorer XL | Scout | WTR | Atmospheric density data | do | Do. |
| Aug. 10 | ATS-IV | Atlas-Centaur | KSC | Charged particle data | do | Do. |
| Aug. 16 | ESSA 7 | Delta | WTR | Spacecraft technology | Failure | Failure. |
| Sept. 18 | Intelsat III | Delta | KSC | Cloud cover photos | Success | Success. ¹ |
| Oct. 3 | ESRO I | Scout | WTR | Communications | Failure | Failure. ¹ |
| Oct. 11 | Apollo 7 | Saturn IB | KSC | Auroras | Success | Success. ¹ |
| Nov. 8 | Pioneer IX | Delta | KSC | First manned Apollo | do | Do. |
| Dec. 5 | TETR-2 | Delta | KSC | Solar radiation | do | Do. |
| Dec. 7 | HEOS 1 | Delta | KSC | Tracking training | do | Do. |
| Dec. 15 | ESSA 8 | Delta | WTR | Interplanetary physics | do | Do. |
| Dec. 18 | Intelsat III | Delta | KSC | Astronomy | do | Do. |
| Dec. 21 | Apollo 8 | Saturn V | KSC | Meteorology | do | Do. |
| | | | | Communications | do | Unrated. ¹ |
| | | | | Scheduled for launch Dec. 21 | | |

¹ Non-NASA mission.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, January 8, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Speaking the truth in love, we are to grow up in every way into Him who is the head.—Ephesians 4: 15.

Our Father in heaven and on earth, whose spirit dwells in the hearts of all men, make us conscious of Thy presence as we bow in prayer before Thee.

We have been taught to walk the way of truth and to live the life of love. May truth so triumph in our minds that we may overcome low prejudices with high principles and may love so live in our hearts that we may relate ourselves affirmatively to our fellow men. With truth and love alive within us may we devote ourselves to the welfare of our beloved country.

In the name of Him whose truth and love keeps men free we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER-ELECT

The SPEAKER. Will any Member-elect who has not been sworn come to the well of the House and take the oath of office.

Mr. LUKENS appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

TRADE AND OTHER TRANSACTIONS INVOLVING SOUTHERN RHODESIA—A COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-37)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States; which

was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, January 7, 1969.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: By virtue of my authority under Section 5 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended, I issued on July 29 Executive Order No. 11419 relating to trade and other transactions involving Southern Rhodesia. It extends the mandatory selective sanctions imposed in Executive Order No. 11322 of January 5, 1967, which I transmitted to you on February 27, 1967. A copy of Executive Order 11419 is attached.

The current Order prohibits virtually all financial and trade transactions between the United States and Southern

Rhodesia. I have delegated to the Secretaries of Commerce, Transportation, and Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the authority to promulgate such regulations as are necessary to carry out the Order.

The Executive Order implements the mandatory provisions of the United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 253 unanimously adopted on May 29, on which the Representative of the United States voted affirmatively. In this resolution the Security Council determined that the situation in Southern Rhodesia continues to constitute a threat to peace under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter and decided that all states should apply comprehensive mandatory sanctions against that territory in accordance with Articles 25 and 41 of the Charter. The Security Council thereby extended the selective sanctions imposed by its earlier Resolutions No. 217 of November 20, 1965 and No. 232 of December 16, 1966, taking note that the measures taken under those resolutions had failed to bring the rebellion in Southern Rhodesia to an end. A copy of Resolution No. 253 is attached.

The resolution requires all member states to extend the earlier prohibitions on imports from and exports to Southern Rhodesia to cover all commodities and products except those needed for medical, educational and humanitarian purposes. The resolution also obligates each member state to prohibit activities promoting or calculated to promote such imports and exports, the shipment and transport of such articles in ships and aircraft of its registry or under charter to its nationals, transfers of funds and economic and other financial resources to persons and bodies in Southern Rhodesia, flights to Southern Rhodesia by aircraft of its registry or aircraft owned or chartered by its nationals, and coordinating operations with airline companies constituted in or aircraft registered in Southern Rhodesia.

I am submitting this report to the Congress in accordance with Section 4 of the United Nations Participation Act, as amended.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

CONGRESS MUST ACT NOW TO STOP CRIPPLING INTEREST RATE INCREASES

(Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a sad day for the people of the United States. The prime rate in the Nation's largest banks has gone to 7 percent. It will soon spread to other banks all over the Nation. That means poor folks, farmers, workers, and small businessmen, will have to pay from 50 to 100 percent more in interest for the money they borrow—assuming they can afford to borrow at all.

This action of forcing higher and higher interest rates on the American people, if not stopped, will lead to the worst depression in our history, bringing along with it massive unemployment, sheriff sales, and bankruptcy.

The only alternative is to return monetary policy to those to whom it belongs—the people and their chosen representatives in Congress.

It is a real challenge for Congress to do something now. Congress is responsible. It is difficult to get Members of Congress interested in doing anything that will affect bankers adversely—not that they are against legislating in the public interest, but because when you step on the toes of the big bankers you cause immediate opposition, which is not only troublesome, but can be disastrous to an elected Member of Congress.

The biggest bankers in the Nation who make the most money from high interest rates are in charge of our monetary policy. Certainly the people who profit from high interest rates should not be allowed to fix the interest rates at higher and higher levels, but this is in fact what is happening.

AT THE ROOT OF THE PROBLEM IS THE FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD AND SYSTEM

The Federal Reserve is not independent, but it claims to be, and, having received support for independence from leading people in Government, has defied the President of the United States and the Congress. The Federal Reserve Board, as study of its actions proves, is most interested in providing profits for the banks.

Congress must recognize its responsibilities in this matter. As it is now, the Federal Reserve acts not only independently of the Congress, which created it, but, in addition, it spends public funds without any accounting or auditing by the General Accounting Office.

As a specific instance of the seriousness of this situation, we all recall that the 1968 Housing Act—which President Johnson said was one of the 10 greatest bills of the 500 he signed while in office—will be effectively scuttled if these higher and higher interest rates continue.

It is of more than passing interest to note that bank profits in 1968 were at all-time highs.

Inflation is given as the cause of these higher interest rates but our own history indicates that the higher interest rates go, the more inflation there is. Inflation cannot be stopped by creating more inflation through higher interest rates.

Stopping inflation with higher interest is about as effective as putting out a fire with gasoline.

Federal Reserve Board Chairman William McChesney Martin's most recent actions are in keeping with the way he has conducted himself as a member of the Board and its Chairman for more than 14 years. Unless appropriate remedial action is taken, the Congress and the administration will have to answer for the tragic unemployment situation that will develop in all sectors of our economy and for the other inevitable facts of depression life.

As chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency and the Joint House-Senate Economic Committee, I shall make it the first order of business for the committees to investigate this matter in detail immediately upon organization of these committees.

PRESIDENTIAL SALARY INCREASE

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is regrettable that the House did not take a record vote on H.R. 10 to double the salary of the President of the United States. I am one of those who hoped for the privilege to vote against the resolution. I recognize the nature of the problems which have brought about its consideration at this time. Yet I feel very strongly that consideration for this measure is premature. The Congress has before it many questions of utmost gravity. All of them demand our attention. To set aside these matters which are of serious import to the security and well-being of the Nation and to make a salary increase one of our first orders of business does not, I regret to state, reflect sound planning or policy. I feel that the President-elect himself would object to this procedure, and that he would not welcome an increase in salary, particularly one of the magnitude proposed, at a time when so many more pressing matters demand the attention of Congress.

PEACE NEGOTIATIONS

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the sorry state of the peace negotiations in Paris should be equally disturbing to the present administration and to the incoming administration. Possibly the Communists are simply stalling until the new U.S. negotiating team arrives following the inauguration of the President-elect. Whatever their reasons, their present tactics have been a poor excuse indeed for complete disruption of the talks on the ground that agreement cannot be reached on a seating arrangement. Unless this picture changes speedily for the better, the United States should break off negotiations and free U.S. military commanders to fight the war in Vietnam to a successful conclusion. The fact that our hands are tied in Paris by tactics which are obviously intended only to delay negotiations does not change the fact that Americans are dying every day in Vietnam. Whatever their number, it is too many. We should not continue to pay this high price in lives indefinitely while the Communists jockey for concessions at the peace table. We have the strength to get the war over and won.

TAXPAYERS RAPPED AGAIN

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned that the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, Price Daniel, has been using Government employees to gather data, write and edit a guide book on State capitols which he and Mrs. Daniel will "author."

Daniel claims he is "coauthoring" this book "as a public service."

When questioned by the General Accounting Office about this project, Daniel admitted he used three employees in the Washington office of the OEP to write and edit this book, as well as the services of unnumbered OEP employees and officials outside Washington.

Mr. Speaker, this is an outrageous abuse of Federal employees by a high Government official who certainly ought to know better. As far as I am concerned Daniel should be made to repay the Treasury for every hour these employees spent on his private project.

If this is typical of the emergencies this office deals with, then I have just heard the best possible argument for abolishing it.

It would seem to me that if Daniel had wanted to perform a real public service he would have gone to the Library of Congress to find out what already had been done on the subject.

When I asked the Library for this information it took them almost no time at all to find seven publications on State capitals. Daniel has had his minions at work on this private project since October.

THE STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT MODERNIZATION ACT OF 1969: A PROGRAM OF FEDERAL GRANTS TO STATES WHICH TAKE STEPS TO MODERNIZE STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. Reuss) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 2519 to provide \$15 billion in Federal grants, over a 3-year period, to States which take steps to modernize State and local governments.

In preparing H.R. 2519, I have relied heavily on the proposals by former Economic Adviser Walter W. Heller and Brookings Institution economist, Joseph A. Pechman, for no-strings-attached Federal grants to the States; on the Committee on Economic Development's July 1966 statement, "Modernizing Local Government," a report on why State and local governments do not work effectively; and on recent studies by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations—ACIR—"Unshackling Local Government," "Metropolitan America: Challenge to Federalism," and "Fiscal Balance in the American Federal System."

Mr. Heller and Mr. Pechman are on the right track, I believe, in urging large-scale, unearmarked Federal grants—over and beyond our present collection of grant-in-aid programs—if our federal system is to survive.

But it would be wasting Federal money unless the States first take steps to enable themselves and their local governments to make the transition into the last third of the 20th century.

I. THE PROBLEM: ARCHAIC, INSOLVENT STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Two crises in American government have become apparent by 1969: our State

and local governments are becoming both insolvent and archaic.

State and local governments desperately need money. The Heller-Pechman proposals have attracted attention because of growing public concern that, even though Federal revenues keep rising as gross national product mounts, State revenues are falling ever short of growing needs.

State and local governments, inefficient and archaic, need modernizing. Several excellent reports, including those by the CED and the ACIR, tell what must be done to reinvigorate these two levels of our federal system.

H.R. 2519 is designed to give the States a mighty impetus toward modernizing State and local governments and toward solving their financial problems.

II. THE NEEDS OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS HAVE OUTSTRIPPED THEIR RESOURCES

The needs of State and local governments continue to grow, for two reasons:

First. Our population continues to grow. The baby boom of World War II years, following the depression years and their low birth rates, has continued during the past two decades because of sustained prosperity. Furthermore, the size of those two age groups which require the costliest public services—the old and the young—has increased at rates faster than that of the rest of the population. While the total population grew during the decade 1957-67 by 16 percent, the school-age population of 5- to 19-year-olds increased at a more rapid rate—by 28 percent—and the over-65 population grew by 27 percent.

Second. Americans are demanding more and better public services. More children study longer in better schools. More police services are needed for a population which is restlessly mobile and is crowded into cities. Cars have outgrown two-lane country roads for expensive city thoroughways. Public health services cost more because of population growth, city living, and advances in medical knowledge. People seeking new jobs move from region to region, from State to State, and country to city, and from central city to suburbs. Public facilities in old communities are abandoned, but new facilities in new communities are needed. Hence, State and local government has been the country's largest growth industry.

Despite increased Federal grants, State and local government resources prove even more inadequate.

First. Annual expenditures by State-local governments during the decade 1957-67 increased by \$59.1 billion—from \$47.6 billion to \$106.7 billion. A significant portion of this increase—54.8 percent—was allocated for health, education, and welfare.

Several factors account for the increasing expenditures. Unit costs rose. Costs of equipment and construction rose rapidly. Salaries of State and local government employees were raised to match salary increases in private industry. Because personal services account for so large a share of State and local government budgets, even moderate adjustments in salaries resulted in large total expenditure.

Second. Even though revenues collected by State and local governments have increased remarkably, they have proved inadequate. During the decade 1957-67 State and local governments general revenue increased by \$53.4 billion—from \$38.2 billion to \$91.6 billion. While Federal tax revenues rose by 65 percent, State and local tax revenues grew by 113 percent, or by \$32.4 billion.

Property taxes supplied almost the entire increase in local tax collections, and 41 percent of the combined State and local tax increases.

Consumer taxes supplied about one-third of the combined increases. From 1957 to date 10 States have imposed general sales taxes. In 1968 sales tax rates were increased in six of the States.

Income taxes supplied only about 16 percent of State-local tax revenue increases from 1957 through 1967. Most of the 36 States having income taxes have made them less progressive by raising rates at lower income levels.

These revenues have been supplemented by Federal grants, which grew by nearly four times during the decade 1957-67—rising from \$4 billion to \$15 billion. In this current fiscal year, 1969, such grants-in-aid are expected to rise to \$20 billion.

But even this Federal contribution accounted in 1967 for only about 17 percent of total State and local general revenues. The remaining 83 percent—about \$51 billion—came from their own sources.

The resulting gap between growing expenditures and lagging receipts has caused State and local government indebtedness to swell steadily. It grew in 1957-67 from \$53 to \$115 billion, an increase of \$62 billion. During the same decade, Federal debt grew by \$55 billion.

The forecast is for a continuing fiscal crisis. Pechman's study concludes that State and local expenditures, even by viewing past experience conservatively, will rise by 7 percent a year and reach \$103 billion by 1970. But revenues, even if gross national product rises at 5 percent a year and both tax receipts and Federal grants keep pace, would reach by 1970 only about \$88 billion. The unfilled gap will be \$15 billion. Richard Netzer, in a projection for the CED, forecast a gap by 1970 of \$10 billion even if State and local tax rates were raised 18 percent.

III. HOW TO FILL THE 1970 GAP BETWEEN STATE AND LOCAL NEEDS AND REVENUES

The States and localities cannot do it.

For the States and localities to meet the \$15 billion gap by borrowing is neither a sound nor a likely solution. State and local government debt rose to \$115 billion in 1967. Many have reached the borrowing limits set by law or by their own financial capacity. The prospects of servicing partly increased debt out of regressive taxes are bleak.

Moreover, it is unlikely that State and localities, unable and unwilling to borrow further, could and would tax to fill the \$15 billion gap. Three reasons argue against this course:

First. To keep raising property and consumer taxes, the leading State and local sources, is poor social and economic policy.

The Federal Government has pre-empted most of the income tax potential. Property taxes on homes and sales taxes on consumer goods unfairly hit lower income people. They could reduce the overall level of demand sufficiently to cause a stagnating economy.

Second. Fear of driving businesses out of the State discourages tax raising in general, and raising progressive taxes, like the income tax, in particular.

Voters of five States recently rejected income taxes or revisions.

Third. Recent elections have shown how vulnerable are State and local officials who raise or try to raise taxes. John Anderson, Jr., the Republican Governor of Kansas in 1961-64 has written:

The rate of "tax mortality" among state and local political leaders is very high. A governor or mayor must raise taxes in order to meet his increasing responsibilities—but he is often voted out of office for doing so. Were he to choose to cut services rather than to raise taxes, he would also be likely to get kicked out.

The Federal Government, however, can and will have the revenues to fill the gap.

As the economy grows, the Federal receipts tend to grow, at a faster rate, because they come largely from the income tax rather than property taxes. The "fiscal dividend" of \$6 to \$10 billion annually has been forecast for the period 1970-75. A Federal surplus depends heavily, of course, upon the course of events in Vietnam; if the war continues at its present level, all fiscal bets are off.

When the 1970-75 "fiscal dividend" appears, the proposal will be made to use it to retire part of the \$363 billion national debt. The answer is that unless the "fiscal dividend" is mainly used either to reduce taxes or to increase expenditures, the fiscal drag will increase unemployment. Indeed, the resulting near recession would prevent the "fiscal dividend" from coming into being in the first place.

Moreover, public needs are so pressing that the Federal surplus should mainly be spent to meet them rather than be rebated in lower taxes. Since many public needs are of a State and local nature, part of the "fiscal dividend" must be channeled to State and local governments.

How to get part of the Federal "fiscal dividend" to State and local governments?

First. By expanding Federal grants-in-aid?

Until 1932, Federal grants accounted for only a small fraction of State and local spending. The grant device was used to rescue State and local governments bankrupted by the depression. Grants rose from \$147 million in 1930 to \$945 million in 1940, an increase of 650 percent. After the brief postwar interlude of abundant revenues, cold war costs caused the Federal Government once more to preempt income tax revenues, while State and local governments faced the crisis of growing population and growing demands. The Federal Government responded again by increasing grants, nearly sixfold in 14 years—from \$2.7 billion in 1954 to \$15.2 billion in 1967.

Should this mushrooming of grants continue? Federal grants represented 7.3 percent of State and local general revenues raised in 1946, 10 percent in 1954, 17 percent in 1967.

Federal grants are a useful way of meeting urgent needs—highway and airport construction, education, housing and community developments, sewer and water treatment facilities, community health and welfare. Therefore, mayors and Governors, even though they call for block grants, want existing Federal categorical grants continued and expanded.

True, the grant device has disadvantages. Many programs are not properly coordinated. For example, six separate programs are available for water supplies. Some programs satisfy only marginal needs. The technique of requiring matching funds sometimes causes State, local, and private authorities to distort their priorities.

The fact that the grant device has over the years developed disadvantages is no argument that grant programs should be ended. But it does argue that the present pattern of categorical grant programs should not be much further extended to new areas, at least without improvement. The vigor and efficiency of State and local governments must be maintained.

Second. By redistributing Federal revenues by general tax reduction, specific tax transfer, or tax credit?

It is unlikely, because of timidity and interstate competition, that States would benefit appreciably if Federal taxes were reduced. When in the 1950's the Federal Government released tax sources by reducing the admissions tax and the electrical energy tax, recovery by State and local governments was minimal. Recovery of Federal tax reductions would probably come by regressive property or sales taxes or by not very progressive income taxes. Moreover, richer States would benefit disproportionately to the poorer States.

A credit against Federal income taxes for certain State and local taxes would help those States which impose no tax, or inadequate taxes, of a particular type. For example, 14 States now have no individual income taxes. A Federal tax credit for State income taxes is a justifiable interstate equalizer; but it, too, favors the wealthy States.

Third. By block grants?

The Heller-Pechman plan proposes that money be distributed to the States on a per capita basis, with a portion redistributed to the poorest States; that grants be unrestricted, except that highway expenditures be excluded and that title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 be observed; and that grants be channeled through a trust fund derived from a set percentage of Federal revenues or of the Federal personal income tax base.

The Heller-Pechman allocation among the States seems progressive and fair. But the "trust fund" seems unduly inflexible, depriving Congress, in a given year, from an overall look at the state of the Nation's economy. Most vulnerable is the complete absence of strings: it encourages State and local governments to languish in archaic inefficiency rather than to demonstrate their initiative, and

thus could result in wasting Federal money.

If these defects can be corrected, the Heller-Pechman proposal offers the soundest method of making the Federal "fiscal dividend" available to State and local governments.

IV. STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS NEED MODERNIZATION

Modernization steps should be taken at three levels—regional, State, and local.

Regional: Recent Federal legislation—including the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, and the Clean Waters Restoration Act of 1966—aims at a necessary regional approach to regionwide problems. But interstate regionalism is in its infancy. Mechanisms are lacking to deal with the 25 metropolitan areas which overlap State lines. Also lacking is interstate cooperation in education. Why, for example, should not several starved universities in sparsely populated States be replaced by one good university?

State governments: Archaic constitutions and statutes result in too many elected executive officers, needless restrictions on borrowing power, poor legislative salaries, short and infrequent legislative sessions, and outmoded personnel practices. The high political mortality rate of those Governors who raise taxes gives little incentive for reform.

Local governments: Only the States, by revising thoroughly their constitutions and statutes, can authorize reform of local governments. The weaknesses of local government are many:

First. Local units are too many and too small to be efficient. Half of all local units in the States contain fewer than 1,000 people.

Second. Overlapping layers: Overlapping layers of local government—counties, cities, townships, special districts, school districts—compete for revenues, and cause gaps and overlaps in problem-solving jurisdiction.

Third. Local voters are apathetic: Less than 30 percent of the electorate votes locally, contrasted with 60 percent presidentially. Over 500,000 local officials are elected, many without policymaking duties, and from overlapping governments. As local government becomes less understandable and less democratic, voter apathy increases, and local government grows more ineffective.

Fourth. Most localities lack strong executive leadership and adequate regulatory and tax authority. Direct line, businesslike administrative authority is usually fragmented. Personnel is largely unqualified, the spoils system widely prevails, and pay is too low. "Home rule" is rare.

Fifth. So far, approaches to metropolitan government have been frustrating. Except for Metropolitan Toronto and Dade County, Fla., little progress toward metropolitan government has been made. A metropolitanwide approach to the problems of poverty and community development is hampered by the Balkanizing proclivity of communities under existing State law. For example, Vernon, Calif., where 236 people live but 70,000

work, is zoned for high-taxpaying industry only, and leaves other communities to provide for its workers. In Wisconsin, communities made up almost entirely of high-income residents have 40 percent of their State income tax returned to them by the State, thus substantially relieving residents of the general property tax.

V. THE PROPOSED STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT MODERNIZATION ACT OF 1969 WOULD USE BLOCK GRANTS TO ENCOURAGE INITIATIVE BY STATES TO REFORM STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

MACHINERY

If H.R. 2519 were enacted in 1969, during the next 2 years, 1970 and 1971, each State wishing to participate would formulate a modern government program. The Federal Government would pay the entire cost of planning. The State plans would be completed within 18 months, and then forwarded to the appropriate regional coordinating committee—eastern, southern, midwestern, and western—created by the bill. The committee would review each State program and suggest improvements through a continuing dialog with State planners. After 6 months, a total of 2 years of planning, the regional coordinating committee by majority vote would send to the President, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and the Congress those State modern government programs which reflect "sufficient creative State initiative so as to qualify that State for Federal block grants."

MODERN GOVERNMENTS PROGRAM

In order to qualify, a State must have on its lawbooks an income tax of at least moderate progressiveness. In addition to this required feature, the programs must include plans and timetables for a whole series of reforms. Not all of these reforms must be in every program, but there must be enough to demonstrate bona fide "creative State initiative."

The checklist of reforms is derived from two main sources.

The first set of reforms—those designed to make State and local government more efficient, economical, and responsive—has been recommended over a long period of time by such good-government organizations as the Committee for Economic Development, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, the Council of State Governments, the National Municipal League, the Mayor's Conference, and the National Association of Counties. These reforms include regional agreements by States, and interstate compacts, for cooperative efforts in health, education, welfare, and conservation; modernized State government, including the short ballot, longer terms for constitutional officers, annual sessions of the legislature, adequately paid legislators, modernized borrowing powers, rationalized boards and commissions, assistance to local governments; modernized local government, including cutting down the number of unnecessary counties, towns, and other local units, working toward all forms of metropolitan government, providing for true home rule, the short ballot, modern borrowing power, the merit system, and decentral-

izing local government in order to make it more democratic and humane.

The second set of reforms—those designed to induce States to remove economic disparities between various local governments—is an extension of current efforts by big-city mayors and by the Federal Government to save the central city. These include revision of State grants-in-aid and sharing of tax revenues so as to eliminate the preferences so widely given to wealthier communities at the expense of poorer communities. Examples are the unfairly large State returns of income tax revenues to the dormitory suburbs peopled by well-to-do residents; of property tax revenues to communities where large utility plants or factories happened to be located; of sales tax revenues to still other communities which happened to have shopping centers widely patronized by outsiders. A related reform is the prohibition of local zoning regulations which keep out low-income housing, or in some cases all homes of any kind, by restricting zoning power in metropolitan areas to larger municipalities and to counties.

BLOCK GRANTS TO STATES WITH MODERN GOVERNMENTS PROGRAMS

States with modern governments programs qualified by both the regional coordinating committees and by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations as reflecting "sufficient State creative initiative so as to qualify that State for Federal block grants" would begin receiving payments in 1972, or at the latest by 1973. They would receive unrestricted Federal grants from the \$5 billion a year, 3-year authorization by the bill.

The funds would be distributed according to population, with not to exceed 20 percent for supplements to those States having a low per capita income; a high degree of poverty, dependency, or urbanization; and State tax effort as indicated by the amount of State and local taxes relative to personal income.

The authorized amount of \$5 billion annually—congressional appropriations could be less, of course, depending upon economic conditions and the degree of participation by the States—is approximately equal to the 2 percent of individual income suggested by Heller, but without the inflexible trust fund device.

The "string" on the block grants would be good-faith initiative by the States in filing a statement of intent—their modern governments programs. The Governors themselves, through their own plans and through the regional review and decision by majority vote, and the widely respected Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, would be the qualifying agents. There would be no statutory strings with respect to compliance with the State plans, although annual reports to Congress are required, and the program runs for 3 years only. No doubt Congress, in considering whether to renew the program, would take into account the good-faith effort made by the States to fulfill their plans.

I would hope that such a good-faith effort would be made. A reform-minded Governor would, for the first time, have

public opinion behind him. Reapportionment is bringing many new and modern legislators to the State capitols. Forty of the 50 States are planning to consider constitutional reforms within the next 2 years. Federal block grants, necessary for fiscal reasons, could be the incentive that catalyzes a movement for major constitutional and statutory reforms.

Planning should begin now for that time, after the economic strain of the Vietnam war eases, when substantial Federal surpluses are available.

The text of H.R. 2519 follows:

H.R. 2519

A bill to improve intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and the economy and efficiency of all levels of government, by providing Federal block grants for State and localities which take steps to modernize State and local government

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "State and Local Government Modernization Act of 1969".

SEC. 2. STATE MODERN GOVERNMENTS PROGRAMS.—

(a) PLANNING FUNDS FOR MODERN GOVERNMENTS PROGRAMS.—The President shall, as soon as possible after the effective date of this Act, grant to the Governors of each of the fifty States which elect to participate in the State modern governments program planning funds to cover the full cost of preparing for each State a modern governments program. There is herewith authorized to be appropriated solely for this purpose and the purpose of paragraph (d) of this section the sum of \$50,000,000, with each State's share to be no less than \$250,000 and with the remainder apportioned according to State population on the basis of the Bureau of the Census current estimates of population.

(b) PREPARATION OF STATE MODERN GOVERNMENTS PROGRAMS.—Not later than eighteen months after such planning funds have been made available to States which have elected to participate, each Governor shall file his State's draft modern governments program with the regional coordinating committee for State modern governments programs, set up pursuant to section 2(d) hereof. Within six months thereafter, the regional coordinating committee shall file the modern governments program for each participating State in the region with the President, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, and the Congress.

(c) CONTENTS OF STATE MODERN GOVERNMENTS PROGRAMS.—Each State modern governments program shall certify that the State has in effect an income tax of at least moderate progressiveness. In addition, such programs shall set forth plans and timetables for modernizing and revitalizing State and local governments, including such matters as:

(1) Proposed arrangements, by interstate compact or otherwise, for dealing with interstate regional problems, including those of metropolitan areas which overlap State lines, regional cooperation in health, education, welfare, and conservation;

(2) Proposed strengthening and modernizing of State governments (by constitutional, statutory, and administrative changes), including recommendations concerning more efficient executives and legislatures, State borrowing powers, taxation and expenditures, and personnel systems;

(3) Proposed strengthening and modernizing of local rural, urban, and metropolitan governments (by constitutional, statutory, and administrative changes), including where needed—

(A) reducing the number of counties,
(B) reducing the number of, or eliminating, local governments too small to provide efficient administration, and special districts not subject to democratic control,

(C) restricting popular elections to policymakers,

(D) concentrating on a single responsible executive for each local unit,

(E) reform of personnel practices so as to base them uniformly on merit and competence,

(F) granting adequate home rule powers to reformed counties and other local governments,

(G) revising the terms of State grants-in-aid and shared taxes so as to encourage modern local governments and to minimize difference in local fiscal capacity,

(H) easing restrictions on local power to tax property,

(I) improving local property tax administration,

(J) authorizing local governments to utilize non-property taxes, coordinated at the State or regional level,

(K) easing restrictions on the borrowing power of local governments,

(L) strengthening local government in metropolitan areas by—

(i) liberalizing municipal annexation of unincorporated areas,

(ii) discouraging new incorporations not meeting minimum standards of total population and population density,

(iii) authorizing transfers of specified functions between municipalities and counties,

(iv) authorizing intergovernmental contracts for the provision of services,

(v) authorizing the municipalities to exercise extraterritorial planning, zoning, and subdivision control over unincorporated areas not subject to effective county regulation,

(vi) restricting zoning authority in metropolitan areas to larger municipalities and to counties, in order to prevent zoning by smaller municipalities which excludes housing for lower-income families,

(vii) authorizing the formation of metropolitan councils of public officials to exchange information and ideas on problems of mutual concern,

(viii) authorizing the establishment by local governmental bodies or by the voters directly of metropolitan area study commissions to develop proposals to improve local governmental structure and services, and to present to the voters of the area such reorganization plans,

(ix) authorizing the formation of metropolitan planning agencies to make recommendations to local governments concerning land use, zoning, building regulations, and capital improvements,

(x) establishing a State agency to assist metropolitan areas,

(xi) furnishing State financial and technical assistance to metropolitan areas for planning, building codes, urban renewal, and local government and finance.

(4) Proposed uses of Federal block grants pursuant to section 3 hereof, including provision for passing on at least 50 per centum of such grants in an equitable manner to local governments.

(d) REGIONAL COORDINATING COMMITTEES FOR STATE MODERN GOVERNMENTS PROGRAMS.—Each participating State shall channel its modern governments program through a regional coordinating committee for State modern governments programs, as set forth in section 2(b) hereof. Such a regional coordinating committee shall be set up for each of the following four regions:

Eastern (Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont);

Southern (Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia, and Kentucky);

Midwestern (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, South Dakota, and Wisconsin);

Western (Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming).

Each regional coordinating committee shall be set up by the participating Governors of the region, with whatever representatives of his State each Governor shall select, and shall operate by a majority vote of the participating States. Each regional coordinating committee shall review the draft State modern governments programs, and shall make recommendations concerning any possible improvements. In forwarding the State modern governments programs to the President, the advisory commission on intergovernmental relations, and the Congress, each regional coordinating committee shall designate each State modern governments program which it believes reflects sufficient creative State initiative so as to qualify that State for Federal block grants under section 3. The regional coordinating committees shall be financed by voluntary agreement by the participating States from the Federal planning funds made available under section 2(a). By unanimous agreement, and subject to equitable funding arrangements, a regional coordinating committee may undertake the preparation of all or part of a modern governments program for any State so requesting.

(e) REVIEW OF STATE MODERN GOVERNMENTS PROGRAMS BY THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS.—The advisory commission on intergovernmental relations, as soon as possible and in not more than one year after the regional coordinating committees have filed with it the State modern governments programs, shall designate which State modern governments program it believes reflects sufficient State creative initiative so as to qualify that State for Federal block grants under section 3; and shall recommend a method for distributing the Federal block grants under section 3 apportioned according to population as determined by the Bureau of the Census on the basis of its current estimates, with not to exceed 20 per centum for supplements to States with low per capita income; a high incidence of poverty, dependency, or urbanization; and State tax effort as indicated by the amount of State and local taxes relative to personal income.

SEC. 3. FEDERAL BLOCK GRANT.—There is herewith authorized to be appropriated for the first three full fiscal years after such State modern governments programs have been filed with the President, the advisory commission on intergovernmental relations, and the Congress, and after the designations of the advisory commission on intergovernmental relations pursuant to section 2(e) have been made, the sum of \$5,000,000,000 annually, to be distributed by the President among all States whose modern governments programs have been designated as qualified by their regional coordinating committees under section 2(d) and by the advisory commission on intergovernmental relations under section 2(e), apportioned according to population as determined by the Bureau of the Census on the basis of its current estimates, with not to exceed 20 per centum authorized to be set aside for supplements to States with low per capita income; a high incidence of poverty, dependency, or urbanization; and State tax effort, as indicated by the amount of State and local taxes relative to personal income. The regional coordinating committees and the advisory commission on intergovernmental relations shall re-

port to the President and the Congress at the end of each fiscal year on the progress made by each participating State in carrying out its modern governments program, and, prior to the end of the third fiscal year, shall make recommendations to the President and the Congress concerning the future of the Federal block grant program.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. REUSS (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BRAY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCHADEBERG) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BUSH.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. DUNCAN.

Mr. WYATT in four instances.

Mr. McEWEN in five instances.

Mr. SCHERLE.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DADDARIO.

Mr. BIAGGI in five instances.

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. ABBITT in two instances.

Mr. FRASER in three instances.

Mr. PODELL in two instances.

Mr. BOGGS.

Mr. PICKLE.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN.

Mr. CONYERS in two instances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, January 9, 1969 at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

169. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report, including a copy of Executive Order No. 11419 and a copy of United Nations Security Council Resolution 253, relating to trade and other transactions involving Southern Rhodesia, pursuant to the provisions of section 5 of the United Nations Participation Act, as amended (H. Doc. No. 91-37); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

170. A letter from the national adjutant, Disabled American Veterans, transmitting the proceedings of the national convention held in Philadelphia, Pa., on August 18-23, 1968, including the proceedings of the Disabled American Veterans for the year ending June 30, 1968, and a report of its receipts and expenditures as of December 31, 1967, pursuant

to the provisions of Public Law 249, 77th Congress, and section 9 of Public Law 668, 77th Congress (H. Doc. 91-38); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

171. A letter from the national adjutant, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc., transmitting the proceedings of the national convention held in New Orleans, La., September 21-25, 1968, including the proceedings of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A. for the year ending September 30, 1968, and a report of its receipts and expenditures, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88-105 and section 15 of Public Law 85-530 (H. Doc. 91-39); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

172. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report, by grade and age, of the number of Coast Guard officers above the grade of lieutenant commander entitled to receive incentive pay for flight duty, and the average monthly incentive pay authorized by law paid to such officers during the 6 months preceding January 7, 1969; to the Committee on Armed Services.

173. A letter from the Sergeant at Arms, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting a statement in writing exhibiting the several sums drawn by him pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 78 and 80, the application and disbursement of such sums, and balances remaining in his hands, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 84; to the Committee on House Administration.

174. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered under the authority contained in section 13(b) of the act of September 11, 1957, as well as a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 13(c) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PATMAN: Joint Committee on Defense Production. Annual report of the Joint Committee on Defense Production Activities (Rept. No. 91-3). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 2494. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 2495. A bill to amend section 131 of title 23 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 2496. A bill to provide for the establishment of the King Range National Conservation Area in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 2497. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase, for 1969 and 1970, the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer from \$600 to \$800, and to provide that for taxable years beginning after

1970 such exemptions shall be \$1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H.R. 2498. A bill to provide appropriations for sharing of Federal taxes with States and their political subdivisions out of funds derived from a cutback in projected new expansion of grant-in-aid programs and as a substitute for portions of existing grant-in-aid expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HEBERT:

H.R. 2499. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the academies of the military departments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia:

H.R. 2500. A bill to include fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of lambs and swine, sausages, prepared or preserved pork, and prepared or preserved beef and veal within the quotas imposed on the importation of certain other meat and meat products; to reduce the percentage applied to certain aggregate quantity estimations used, in part, to determine such quotas from 110 to 100 percentum, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 2501. A bill to provide for the inclusion of Panola and Shelby Counties, Tex., within the Marshall division of the eastern district for the U.S. district courts in Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2502. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern district of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 2503. A bill to promote the safety of workers engaged in making asbestos products for shipment in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH:

H.R. 2504. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 2505. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate within the Department of the Interior an officer to establish, coordinate, and administer programs authorized by this act, for the reclamation, acquisition, and conservation of lands and water adversely affected by coal mining operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2506. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act in order to provide for a national powerplant siting study and a national powerplant siting plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 2507. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head of household benefits to unmarried widows and widowers, and individuals who have attained age 35 and who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced for 3 years or more, who maintain their own households; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2508. A bill to impose quota limitation on imports of foreign residual fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2509. A bill to encourage the growth of international trade on a fair and equitable basis; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2510. A bill to amend the definition of "metal bearing ores" in the Tariff Schedules of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2511. A bill to provide for the orderly marketing of flat glass imported into the United States by affording foreign supplying nations a fair share of the growth or change in the U.S. flat glass market; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2512. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2513. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2514. A bill to provide for orderly trade in textile articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 2515. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer from \$600 to \$1,000 over a 4-year period beginning with 1970; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 2516. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for correction of inequities respecting losses of retired pay sustained by certain individuals who retired from the Armed Forces before June 1, 1958; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYATT (for himself and Mr. RUPPE):

H.R. 2517. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink, whether or not dressed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 2518. A bill to amend section 333 of title 38, United States Code, to provide that veterans who serve 2 or more years in peacetime shall be entitled to a presumption that chronic diseases becoming manifest within 1 year from the date of separation from service are service connected; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. REUSS:

H.R. 2519. A bill to improve intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and the economy and efficiency of all levels of government, by providing Federal block grants for States and localities which take steps to modernize State and local government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 2520. A bill to provide for the extension of the reclamation acts, as amended, to all of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 2521. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedule of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on paper industries machinery; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAHILL:

H.R. 2522. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.J. Res. 204. Joint resolution to provide for the resumption of trade with Rhodesia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.J. Res. 205. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN (for himself and Mr. GROVER):

H. Con. Res. 66. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing as a House document of certain maps and indicia relating to Vietnam and the Asian continent; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H. Res. 102. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H. Res. 103. A resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H. Res. 104. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to create a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. Res. 105. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Armed Services to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of all matters relating to procurement by the Department of Defense, personnel of such Department, laws administered by such Department, use of funds by such Department, and scientific research in support of the armed services; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 106. Resolution to provide for the expenses of the investigation and study authorized by House Resolution 105; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 2523. A bill for the relief of Leonora M. Baldemor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2524. A bill for the relief of Miguel Q. Orejudos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2525. A bill for the relief of Joaquin T. Quijencio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAMS (by request):

H.R. 2526. A bill for the relief of Pedro Presto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BIAGGI:

H.R. 2527. A bill for the relief of Santi Fiumara and his wife, Concetta Fiumara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.R. 2528. A bill for the relief of Barbara Caudell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2529. A bill for the relief of Anna Giovine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2530. A bill for the relief of Eva Anna-Lisa Sjoborg Nylund; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2531. A bill for the relief of Jutta Elisabeth Winkelstroeter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. CHISHOLM:

H.R. 2532. A bill for the relief of Linely Baptiste; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 2533. A bill for the relief of Takio Nozu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2534. A bill for the relief of John Dennis Chambers, Vicki Jill Chambers, Phillip Michael Chambers, Peter Gregory Chambers, and Kathleen Anne Chambers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 2535. A bill for the relief of Asunsion S. Castro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2536. A bill for the relief of Francesca Adriana Fatta (Millonzi); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2537. A bill for the relief of Concetta Fulco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2538. A bill for the relief of Salvatore D. Inga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2539. A bill for the relief of the survivors of police officers John Nagle and Anthony Perri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2540. A bill for the relief of Ming Chia and Mei Jok Phua; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2541. A bill for the relief of Samuel M. Santibanez and Patria Santibanez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER (by request):

H.R. 2542. A bill for the relief of Elena, Uldarico, Jr., Maria Elena, Regis, Ervin, and Maria Celeste Blando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2543. A bill for the relief of Bartolomeo and Giovanna Bonsignore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 2544. A bill for the relief of Dr. Vall Khairollahi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2545. A bill for the relief of György Szanto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAYDOS:

H.R. 2546. A bill for the relief of Faye S. Tushan, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 2547. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth Villanueva Samonte Leek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H.R. 2548. A bill for the relief of Esperanca de Amorim Fernandes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2549. A bill for the relief of Venus Bayhon Gomez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 2550. A bill for the relief of Maria Adelaide Soares Aguiar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2551. A bill for the relief of Guglielmo Tonino Alleva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2552. A bill for the relief of John Vincent Amiralet; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2553. A bill for the relief of Vedat Fahreddin Arkay and Mohaddes Arkay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2554. A bill for the relief of Antonino Azzaro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2555. A bill for the relief of Ayala Barel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2556. A bill for the relief of Julia B. Bernardo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2557. A bill for the relief of Saverio Bruzzese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2558. A bill for the relief of Assuntina Buonapane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2559. A bill for the relief of Antonio Mario Buzzanga; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2560. A bill for the relief of Francesco Carriglio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2561. A bill for the relief of Silvestre de Brito Caetano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2562. A bill for the relief of Yru Gok Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2563. A bill for the relief of Mario da Silva Costa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2564. A bill for the relief of Gil Pereira da Cunha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2565. A bill for the relief of Maria Salome da Cunha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2566. A bill for the relief of Pompilio da Cunha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2567. A bill for the relief of Michele D'Aleo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2568. A bill for the relief of Teresa Galli D'Aleo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2569. A bill for the relief of Angela Margarida Da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2570. A bill for the relief of Antonio Pereira Da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2571. A bill for the relief of Clarinda Duarte Da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2572. A bill for the relief of Jose de Mendonca da Silva and Florentina Correia da Conceicao da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2573. A bill for the relief of Manuel De Sousa Da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2574. A bill for the relief of Valentina Augusto Da Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2575. A bill for the relief of Hameed and Noor Fatima Dean (Din) and their minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2576. A bill for the relief of Firminio Antonio De Borja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2577. A bill for the relief of Maria Carasao de Jesus and Manuel Tamaz Nogueira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2578. A bill for the relief of Maria Pereira de Medeiros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2579. A bill for the relief of Eduardo Monis de Melo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2580. A bill for the relief of Manuel Correia de Mendonca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2581. A bill for the relief of Rafaela De Padova; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2582. A bill for the relief of Joao De Quadros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2583. A bill for the relief of Artemizia Dias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2584. A bill for the relief of Irvia DiFiore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2585. A bill for the relief of Mark Djonaj; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2586. A bill for the relief of Nella Isabel da Trindade Bettencourt Dore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2587. A bill for the relief of Marie G. Ewerton; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2588. A bill for the relief of Ronald K. Fairweather; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2589. A bill for the relief of Domingos Silverio Ferro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2590. A bill for the relief of Manuel Furtado Gabriel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2591. A bill for the relief of Carmelo Genna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2592. A bill for the relief of Maria I. Gomes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2593. A bill for the relief of Beatriz Martins Gouveia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2594. A bill for the relief of Chan Yuk Heng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2595. A bill for the relief of Goon Mee Heung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2596. A bill for the relief of Antonio Iula; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2597. A bill for the relief of Dimitra Kassola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2598. A bill for the relief of Spyridon Kavadas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2599. A bill for the relief of Gaetano La Bella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2600. A bill for the relief of Luisa Clella La Pietra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2601. A bill for the relief of Gabriel de Sousa Leal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2602. A bill for the relief of Girolamo Lentini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2603. A bill for the relief of Manuel Lima; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2604. A bill for the relief of Maria Espinola Ramos Lobao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2605. A bill for the relief of Angelo Marchio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2606. A bill for the relief of Luigi F. Marotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2607. A bill for the relief of Jose Costa Marques and Almerinda de Matos Sao Marcos Bom and their minor child; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2608. A bill for the relief of Manuel Marques; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2609. A bill for the relief of Hernan Pavon Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2610. A bill for the relief of Solomon Erick Newman Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2611. A bill for the relief of Domenico, Serafina, and Maria Mazzel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2612. A bill for the relief of Gaspare Muraca; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2613. A bill for the relief of Rosa Tindara Nasisi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2614. A bill for the relief of Samuel N. Newman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2615. A bill for the relief of Jose Oliveira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2616. A bill for the relief of Friedrich Peter Ott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2617. A bill for the relief of Luigi Papa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2618. A bill for the relief of Carlos S. Adolfo Pavon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2619. A bill for the relief of Maria Helena da Silva Pereira; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2620. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis A. Perlengas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2621. A bill for the relief of Riziero Pesce, Giuseppe Pesce, Zina Pesce, and En-

rico Pesce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2622. A bill for the relief of Armando Pisanelli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2623. A bill for the relief of Amalia Placidi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2624. A bill for the relief of Americo Placidi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2625. A bill for the relief of Jose Pinto Repas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2626. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Russo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2627. A bill for the relief of Manuel da Cunha Santos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2628. A bill for the relief of Manuel Gil Santos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2629. A bill for the relief of Saverio Scalzi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2630. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Scorsone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2631. A bill for the relief of Palmira Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2632. A bill for the relief of Battista Sorrentino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2633. A bill for the relief of Paul Stavropoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2634. A bill for the relief of Shwen-Sing Tai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2635. A bill for the relief of Akira Takahashi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2636. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Talarico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2637. A bill for the relief of Calogero

Tardanico; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2638. A bill for the relief of Vincenzo Francisco Taverna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2639. A bill for the relief of Pietro Evarista Tonolini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2640. A bill for the relief of Goon Wing Wah; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 2641. A bill for the relief of Rafael Hernandez-Rangel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2642. A bill for the relief of Ezatolla Partovi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 2643. A bill for the relief of Leonard Ronald Currie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2644. A bill for the relief of Pietro Giuseppe Serini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 2645. A bill for the relief of Mesaros Mihalj; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. Res. 107. Resolution to refer the bill, H.R. 1507, entitled "A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John T. Knight" to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims in accordance with sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 108. Resolution referring H.R. 1390 to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MORE THINGS ARE WROUGHT BY PRAYER THAN THIS WORLD DREAMS OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1969

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the Congress of the United States will have the high honor of holding a joint meeting to welcome Col. Frank Borman, Capt. James A. Lovell, Jr., and Lt. Col. William A. Anders, America's three astronauts who have just completed the most magnificent and significant journey ever undertaken in the history of mankind. They will stand before the U.S. Congress, as they have stood before the American Republic and the rest of the world, as symbols of the synthesis and application of the total knowledge and skill thus far amassed and attained by the human race.

The quotation above, that heads these remarks, was spoken by the dying King Arthur to Sir Bedivere in Tennyson's "The Passing of Arthur," and summarize the faith that man has in his Creator, and the acknowledgment by man that in his span of years he will often stand in an attitude of awe and wonder before things and sights that there is much he never will know, and much that he cannot hope to fathom. Man must "lift up his eyes unto the hills."

It was surely in this sense that Astronaut Borman read the following prayer from Apollo 8:

Give us, O God, the vision which can see Thy love in the world in spite of human failure. Give us the faith, the trust, the goodness, in spite of our ignorance and weakness. Give us the knowledge that we may continue to pray with understanding hearts and show us what each one of us can do to set forth the coming of the day of universal peace.

Hope and faith; without them man is nothing and with them man knows he can look forward. Mankind's hope and faith has been expressed in many moving ways; one is as follows:

And God shall make thy soul a glass
Where 18,000 eons pass;
And thou shalt see the shining worlds
As men see dew upon the grass.

Christmas Eve, 1968; behind them, hanging in space, the three astronauts of Apollo 8 could see a sight human eyes had never seen before—the "shining world" of earth, viewed from almost a quarter of a million miles. Below them, just 70 miles away, was the surface of the moon, 18,000 eons old—and more—in its age of 4½ billion years.

The moment was in its way equivalent to that unknown and unrecorded instant, buried no one knows how many millions of years back in time, when for the first time some early man saw the full moon rise into the sky, and stretched out his hands toward it, half in fear, half in hope. It was a beginning, once again, and as Apollo 8 moved into the lunar sunrise, a waiting, watching, and listening earth heard the voices of the three astronauts reading the first 10 verses of the first chapter of the Book of Genesis:

In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.

And God said, Let there be light; and there was light.

And God saw the light, that it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness.

And God called the light Day, and the darkness he called Night.

And the evening and the morning were the first day.

And God said, Let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters, and let it divide the waters from the waters.

And God made the firmament and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament; and it was so.

And God called the firmament Heaven. And the evening and the morning were the second day.

And God said, Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together into one place, and let the dry land appear; and it was so.

And God called the dry land Earth; and the gathering together of the waters called the Seas; and God saw that it was good.

During World War II it was said, often, and I think, correctly, that "There are no atheists in foxholes." Communist cynicism and irreverence aside, neither are there, nor, I believe, will there be, in space. The prayer and the recitation of the stately, moving, and cadenced verses of the Book of Genesis by the crew of Apollo 8 were the first, but certainly will not be the last, open admissions of what every man will surely feel—and reflect upon—as he enters into the incredible vastness on journeys uncharted, over distances immense, into a void without boundaries.

And while, with silent, uplifting mind, I've trod, That high, untrodden sanctity of Space, Put out my hand, and touched the face of God.

TRIBUTE TO STAN BAHNSEN

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1969

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, Stan Bahnsen, a pitcher for the New York Yankees, has achieved the honor of being selected the 1968 American League Rookie of the Year.

This is the first time anyone from my congressional district has attained this distinction. We are all pleased and very proud of his performance as an athlete.

On January 9, the citizens of Council Bluffs, Iowa, will pay tribute to Stan for his outstanding accomplishments. We appreciate the opportunity to "show off" our honored citizen. We are grateful for the fame he has brought to his hometown and the State of Iowa.

America's leadership rests in the hands of the youth typical of this fine young man who has the ability to excel. Stan Bahnsen has demonstrated this leadership through his dedication to perfection in his chosen field, a baseball career.

My colleagues, I commend his feats to you and ask that you join with me and the people of Council Bluffs, Iowa, in their salute to the American League Rookie of the Year, Stan Bahnsen.

OPPRESSION CONTINUES IN GREECE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, reports continue to appear in some segments of the American press on the relentless oppressiveness of the military regime that has ruled Greece since April 1967.

One such report appeared in the January 6 issue of the Nation magazine. The report, datelined Strasbourg, France, was written by James Becket. Mr. Becket is a Harvard Law School graduate who is studying for an advanced degree at the University of Geneva. He is a young man who is intimately familiar with developments in Greece since the coup.

Mr. Becket's article tells a very human side of the hearings now underway before the European Human Rights Commission on charges against the Greek junta of violating the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. The article follows:

GREEK JUNTA ON TRIAL

STRASBOURG, FRANCE.—In September of 1967 the governments of Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Holland filed an application with the European Human Rights Commission charging the Greek junta with violating

nearly all the basic articles of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. The case dragged on for more than a year through purely legal and procedural stages, but last month when a subcommittee convened in Strasbourg to hear testimony on torture, the human element of human rights burst upon the commission. The French provincial city was the scene of a drama reminiscent of both James Bond and the Keystone Cops. Two witnesses brought by the junta escaped their guards. Rushing about Strasbourg all week were officers of the French Sûreté, armed junta thugs, international lawyers, Greek exiles and hordes of journalists. Not only is the case on its way to becoming a landmark in the history of the international protection of human rights, but it has assumed an immediate political importance.

The European Commission on Human Rights came into existence after World War II. Empowered to hear cases brought by individuals or member states, the basic functions of the commission are to find the facts of a dispute and to attempt a "friendly settlement." It has not been easy for the Scandinavians to press the case. Not only has pressure from many quarters been exerted on them to abandon their efforts, but it has been difficult to find witnesses outside Greece who were willing to testify, especially witnesses who had been tortured. The junta does not permit anyone who has been tortured to leave Greece, and recently they have been forcing torture victims to sign declarations that they were well treated.

The delegation of the Greek regime flew from Athens to Paris on Saturday, November 23. In this delegation of forty-nine which took the train to Strasbourg were not only lawyers and witnesses but members of the Greek security police, the military police (ESA), the Greek CIA (KYP), and *pistoleris* attached to the Prime Minister's office. Three of the witnesses were soon to find themselves on the front pages of the world press—two because they appeared before the commission and one because she didn't.

On Sunday Constantine Melitis, 33, a grocer from Salonika, and Pandelis Marketakis, 38, a car mechanic from Crete, sat with their guards in the hotel dining room puzzling over the menu. A Greek came up and offered to help. This man belonged to Andreas Papandreu's Panhellenic Liberation Movement (PAK). Through him the two witnesses found the chance they were looking for; they managed to elude their guards and arrive at the Grand Hotel to ask the Norwegian delegation for protection. The story had still not broken on Monday when an emissary of the junta came to the Grand Hotel "on his own" to ask that the "kidnapped" witnesses be handed over for "humanitarian reasons."

The two witnesses turned out to have quite a story to tell. Melitis had been the driver of the car in which a leftist deputy named Tsarouchas was arrested last May between Salonika and Athens. Melitis was savagely beaten, his cheekbone shattered, but at least he arrived alive in Salonika. Tsarouchas died of a "heart attack." Melitis broke under the KYP tortures of *jalanga* (bastinado), mock execution, and worst of all electric torture when electrodes were attached to his genitals. Marketakis, who lost an eye fighting the Communists in 1948, was arrested in Crete after an explosion in a factory. He went through seventy-five days of systematic torture, nearly dying of internal bleeding. When both men were finally released, the police spread the story that they had betrayed their comrades. Isolated and without work, they were cultivated by the police, who planned to use them as prosecution witnesses whenever needed. Given the ever-present threat to their families, the police believed they could count on them. They were brought to France as "tame" witnesses.

The subcommittee began hearing evidence on Monday morning in a highly charged atmosphere. Proceedings before the commission are absolutely secret. (It is doubtful that any sovereign state would sign the Convention if they were public.) However, the witnesses themselves, if unable to tell what happened inside the commission, were able to relate their experiences in Greece. Lieutenant (j.g.) Marotis-Lanas of the Greek Navy's South Aegean Command, formerly in charge of the junta's security office of Pireaus and the Aegean islands (he defected after the King's coup) told of watching Greeks being tortured, told of picking bodies up on the beaches around Athens, and told of a secret interrogation center in Agios Paraskevas, near the American College, where the camp commander proudly showed him his latest torture equipment. (The Greek delegation admitted the existence of this hitherto secret camp, but claimed it was a NATO camp for "interrogating" Eastern Europeans.) The witness also told of a police list of nearly 1,000 names of those in hiding who were to be killed on capture. (Tsarouchas had been on the list.) Most important as to direct junta responsibility was Lieutenant Marotis-Lanas' testimony that in his presence Minister of the Interior Pattakos gave orders to torture and kill specific persons. Miss Kiti Arseni, 30, told of her nightmarish torture a year ago on the notorious "terrazza" of the Bouboulinas Street Security Police Station. Arrested for passing along a "freedom poem" of Theodorakis, she suffered *jalanga* as well as being beaten all over her naked body with a plated steel wire. The climax was when her brother, an army draftee, was brought in and forced to beat her himself. Even those observers who knew about torture in Greece were shocked by the picture that emerged. Rather than the work of an occasional Balkan sadist, it is a highly programmed modern enterprise.

On Wednesday morning the two Greek *transfuges* left the Grand Hotel under heavy police escort, ran the gauntlet of television and press to enter the modern commission building where armed Greek heavies and Council of Europe police milled about the corridors. The French, aware that the Greeks were armed, were under orders from Paris to avoid any incidents on the premises. After the witnesses had testified, they were whisked back by the *Sûreté* to their original hotel to retrieve their luggage. In a dramatic confrontation, the head of the Greek delegation, Mr. Koutoupis, told Marketakis: "For what you have done today your children will pay."

The drama then shifted to the fate of a third Greek witness, Miss Zaira Peta, who never appeared before the commission. (She had been in Bouboulinas at the same time as Miss Arseni.) Sunday she was in tears at dinner and each time she left her room she was flanked by two Greek guards. At least one journalist was roughed up for inquiring about her. Wednesday Miss Peta disappeared. The Greek delegation gave out three different stories as to why she was unable to appear: she was sick, her sister was sick, and business commitments necessitated her im-

*A Reuters story of December 18 reported that Mr. Marketakis was in London, accompanied by Greek Government officials, en route from Stockholm to Athens. His official "interpreter" said that Marketakis retracted allegations of torture, alleged that he had been kidnapped by "Communists in Strasbourg," and had been forced to say what he did under the threat of "twenty revolvers." The Greek Embassy in Stockholm also announced that he had been held earlier in Norway by "twenty anarchists" (a number apparently favored by junta spokesmen). Before turning him over to his countrymen, the Swedish police questioned Mr. Marketakis, who however, maintained that he was returning home of his own volition.—The Editors.

mediate return to Athens. Miss Peta is a seamstress.

Meanwhile the case gradually proceeds. More evidence on torture is being heard in mid-December, then the commission plans to hear witnesses in Greece. If a "friendly settlement" is not reached (and it is difficult to imagine how wholesale torture and murder can be subject to this formula), the commission will submit a report to the Council of Ministers, which is made up of the Foreign Ministers of the Council of Europe countries. After a three-month waiting period, they will seek a solution.

For international law and the developing international protection of human rights, this case is an important test. Here the concepts of national sovereignty and human rights clash. Before leaving Greece, Markakis and Melitis had been told that foreigners were attacking Greece and that they would go to the Greek consulate in Strasbourg to give testimony. True, they had been beaten some themselves, but that was between Greeks and abroad they would be patriots. The existing aspect of this case from the standpoint of human rights law (as well as from the standpoint of the victims) is that it is a Norwegian's business when a fellow European's human rights are violated. The question remains whether the rather fragile international mechanism can bear the strain of this case, the most important it has ever faced. The Greek investigation will make or break the commission. If it is unable to protect such basic human rights as the right to be free from torture, it will be exposed as an institution able to handle only procedural issues which provide articles in learned legal periodicals. The case is dynamite for its political implications—not only in Greece, where heads are sure to roll as a result of last month's fiasco but also in Europe and the Atlantic Alliance.

Even though this is supposedly a European matter, the proceedings were held under the long shadow of the United States. American diplomats at such institutions as the Council of Europe, the Common Market and NATO have put considerable pressure on the Europeans to ease up on the Colonels. The United States argues that "communications must be kept open" with the Papadopoulos regime. If the allies were to push too hard, dangerous hard-liners might take over. But given the situation in the Mediterranean, stability not democracy has top priority. Observers at the Council of Europe, believing that NATO calls the tune, are pessimistic that the Council of Ministers would act even on a finding of genocide by the commission if it opposed what the United States conceived its NATO interests to be. But pressure is building up on the Colonels and the Americans. After the drama of Strasbourg, the one newspaper in Norway which has been sympathetic to the Colonels, the conservative *Morgenblatt* wrote: "NATO must choose—Greece or Norway."

A second article worth noting, Mr. Speaker, appeared in the latest issue of *News of Greece*, the bimonthly newsletter of the U.S. Committee for Democracy in Greece.

This report summarizes the pertinent details on the Greek constitutional referendum of last September 29 and the subsequent public protest November 3 at the funeral of former Prime Minister George Papandreu. It is clear from the account of these two "plebiscites" that the face of Greece that the junta would like to present to the world sometimes has far different features from the country's true face. Following is the second article:

TWO PLEBISCITES

THE FALSE PLEBISCITES

Predictably, the "plebiscite" of September 29 resulted in an overwhelmingly favorable vote for the constitution proposed by the junta, who counted the votes. In most rural areas, where the conduct of the voting was not subject to foreign scrutiny, the "yes" vote approached 100 per cent; in some it may have exceeded that figure. Each voter was given a "yes" and a "no" ballot, one of which he had to deposit in the ballot box. In rural areas the knowledge that the local gendarme might ask to see the remaining ballot—even if in fact he did not—was probably quite sufficient to discourage dissidence.

In the Athens-Piraeus area, however, there were foreign observers at many polling places. Only 77.3 percent of the voters were officially reported to have voted "yes." Even more significant, 22.3 percent of the voters in the country as a whole abstained, in spite of the fact that the junta had made voting compulsory under pain of imprisonment and other penalties.

The promise that the referendum would be conducted under conditions of "absolute freedom" was half-kept, a rather higher percentage than was usual for the junta's promises; anyone who wished to urge a "yes" vote was completely free to do so. For opponents, the story was different. After having promised to release political leaders from imprisonment and house arrest so that they could debate the proposed constitution, the junta did indeed, release seven of all those it held, one week before the vote—with a warning that if they said anything they would be immediately rearrested. And an American family, who displayed a "no" in their car window, were pursued into the U.S. Embassy by the Greek police. This resulted in an official American protest and an apology from the junta.

But the Embassy offered no sanctuary to eight million Greeks, and they received no apology from the junta.

And after

The junta did not wait long before taking action against those who had defied it by staying away from the polls. To be sure, it could scarcely put a quarter of the Greek voters in prison. But it announced that those who had not voted must submit written explanations to the police. Those who could not present doctors' certificates, to prove that they had been sick, were debarred from obtaining or renewing driving licenses or automobile circulation permits; they were also not allowed to sell their cars.

Three Greek citizens filed suits to annul the elections. One of them told the Supreme Court that, after he filed suit, Deputy Premier Pattakos threatened to imprison him if he did not withdraw it. Another of the petitioners, Manolis Glezos, was already imprisoned, as he had been since the coup. But the Supreme Court—which had been purged and packed with the junta's adherents—threw out all three suits; a "revolutionary" government, it ruled, had the right to make its own laws.

Meanwhile, nothing has changed; the provisions of the new constitution for the formation of political parties, the holding of elections, and the protection of even minimal civil liberties, remain suspended. Martial law continues, and courts-martial enforce it. And the junta continues to amend its new constitution by decree.

THE TRUE PLEBISCITE

On Sunday, November 3, the people of Athens reaffirmed their loyalty to George Papandreu, and to the democracy which he symbolized. They filled the Cathedral for the funeral services and at least 50,000 of them gathered outside in Constitution Square,

while another 250,000 or more lined the route of the funeral procession.

The junta had offered to give him a state funeral, complete with contingents of the armed forces; it sought to imprison him behind its bayonets in death as it had for so many of the last months of his life. But neither in life nor in death did George Papandreu compromise with the oppressors of his country. His family rejected the offer of a state funeral and insisted on a private one, attended only by those who were closest to him—the people of Greece.

In the cathedral, Panayotis Kanellopoulos spoke for all who love liberty, in Greece and elsewhere. He declared: "I bow before George Papandreu in the name of our past conflicts, all of which took place within the arena of democracy." Other political leaders, ranging from Mikis Theodorakis to Constantine Karamanlis, sent wreaths. Outside, the crowd chanted the name of Papandreu, as they had at the great meetings he addressed between July 1965 and the colonels' coup.

The square was filled with shouts of "Democracy" and "You will always be our leader!" Along the route of the funeral procession, Athenians called out: "Today is the day we vote no!" And at the grave several hundred young people took up the shout: "The giant is fallen! He leaves an heir, Andreas! Liberty! Liberty!" Others cried out: "Papandreu, now you are free!"

And after

It was a demonstration whose meaning nobody could mistake, even the junta's megaphone Byron Stamatopoulos, who told reporters that "only a few hundred" demonstrators had turned up. The police sought to contain the crowd and to avoid a clash whose outcome would have been unpredictable. Only toward the end did they beat some demonstrators and make some forty arrests on the outskirts of the throng; two days later the Athens court-martial gave twenty-nine of those arrested prison terms ranging from eighteen months to four years and eight months.

STRENGTHENING THE UNITED NATIONS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the year just passed was marked by violence, destruction, and fear. I think most people were glad to see the year end, and no matter who each would have preferred for President, our prayers for President-elect Nixon are fervent. We are appalled at the prospect of more Vietnams, and we know that the United States is not really protected by our present nuclear superiority, for it is based only on a balance of terror.

We are, therefore, hopeful that our new President's pledge to strengthen the United Nations will be honored decisively and powerfully. The leading newspaper in my congressional district, the *San Jose Mercury and News*, recently contained an excellent editorial on this matter which I commend to my colleagues:

NIXON AND THE U.N.

President-elect Richard M. Nixon this week reaffirmed the intention of his administration to work within and to strengthen the framework of the United Nations as a force of peace.

The thing won't be easy to do, but if a means can be found to do it, the American people would surely give Richard Nixon a second four years in the White House on the strength of that one accomplishment alone.

A "return" to the United Nations, if it can be called that, would accord wholly with the present temper of the American people, who want no more Vietnams and who wish nothing more fervently than to find a way to reduce the world-police role which has evolved on the United States.

The problem arose originally, of course, because the United Nations post-Korea ceased to be an effective international policeman. The United States, convinced of the necessity of stemming the forcible export of "wars of national liberation," stepped into the breach. It has been a bloody, expensive and unhappy affair, and the American people would vastly prefer to be in some other business if the transition can be managed with safety.

It might just be possible, and it might just be that Richard Nixon is coming to the White House at the right time to make it possible.

The world today is far different than it was when the U.N. sent armed forces to counter Communist China's at first covert and then overt invasion of South Korea. It is a different world both for the free nations and for the Communist bloc nations, and it is this fact that gives Nixon greater opportunity for diplomatic initiative.

The giants of world communism have seen events within their spheres of influence force changes in the direction of their own dynamism. They are no less interested in world revolution today—as a theoretical concept—than they ever were. However, as a practical matter, they have more immediate and pressing problems. For the Soviet Union there is the matter of security in Europe and Asia coupled with rising expectations on the part of the Soviet peoples. For China, there is the fierce struggle of the Maoist succession, economic stagnation and security along its Soviet borders.

Nobody, east or west, wants a nuclear war, and the spread of the nuclear capability seems only to strengthen the balance of terror. Fear of mutual destruction may not be the noblest of motives, but if it preserves the human species it will do until something nobler comes along.

In the meantime, the U.N. should, of course, be reorganized so as to deal more effectively with international discord. The time may be ripe for the Nixon administration to advance this cause—as beneficial to the nation and to the world at large.

REPORT TO SPONSOR

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1969

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, the following are the reports of two fine young citizens of my district, Miss Clothilde Cheramie and Mr. Jules Cochiar, Jr., who were delegates from the Joseph Roberts, Jr., American Legion Post No. 344, of Lafitte, La., to a statewide meeting of young people in my home State this past year. Their reports contain a great deal of information on the subject of good citizenship and, I think, reflect the attitudes of the vast majority of responsible young Americans. I know that the following will be of interest to my colleagues:

CXV—22—Part 1

REPORT TO SPONSOR

(By Clothilde Cheramie)

Father Lorio, Commander of the American Legion, President of the American Legion Auxiliary, Congressman Hale Boggs, members of the American Legion and Auxiliary, Honored Guest and friends.

The purpose of Pelican Girl's State was to educate us, as young citizens in the duties, privileges, rights, and responsibilities of American Citizenship. We obtained this education by actually performing the duties and using the privileges and rights of an American citizen. From the time I became a citizen of Pelican Girl's State, I put everything I had into it, so that I could do my part in making the 1968 session of Pelican Girl's State one of the best. But it didn't end when Pelican State ended. It was only the beginning. What I have gotten out of Pelican Girl's will be carried on through the rest of my life.

When we look back at that long week, we think of all the times we were tired and sleepy and physically and mentally exhausted, but we also remember all the good things we brought home with us which outweighs the bad times, the vast amount of knowledge about government, political parties, and civil offices which we hadn't had the slightest idea about before. We cherish the friends we made in such a short time and cried when we had to part with them.

I realize now how fortunate I was to be selected as one of the top 800 girls in the state of Louisiana, and I would like to say this: we see and hear about all the riots and demonstrations the teenagers of today are supposed to be responsible for, and we shake our head and condemn all because of a small minority group compared to the number of teenagers in our country today. I said minority because they only make up a minority because the majority is made up by teenagers who love their country and are proud to be a part of this great country just as you are.

It was great to come in contact with 1200 boys and girls who feel this way about their country. I think Pelican State makes you stop and realize that it is now your turn to take the responsibilities upon yourself as a young citizen of your country. They say that you come back from Pelican Girl's State as a changed person, I don't think you actually change but rather the real you comes out, the one that you've been hiding and now have the chance to express. I would like to describe Pelican Girl's State as a Great Emotional experience which is rare to come upon.

Now I would like to take this opportunity to thank each and everyone of you who made it possible for me to be a citizen of the mythical 51st state, Pelican Girl's State, something which I will remember and treasure for the rest of my life.

REPORT TO SPONSOR

(By Jules Cochiar, Jr.)

Commander, Madam President, Father Lorio, Congressman Hale Boggs, members, honored guests and friends.

I come here tonight feeling like a fellow veteran. The reason for this is because during my stay at Pelican Boy's State, I marched so much I thought I was in the army. Let me give you an example of one typical day. Starting off early in the morning (7:00) a march to breakfast, from there we marched to convocation, another march to our city hall for city elections, such as mayor, commissioner of finance, city judge and so on, marched back to lunch, then to convocation again, from there to athletics and supper.

The one thing left out of our schedule, was sleep, we were fortunate, if we averaged two or three hours a night, but all kidding aside there were also the good times I had. The Governor's Ball, our visit to the capitol

and making new friends, were among the few.

The two days I disliked the most were the first day when everything was new to me and the last day, when I had to bid farewell to Pel State and all my new friends, the rest of our days were filled with participation in government and the realization that we the youth of today will be the citizens of tomorrow and hold the future of our Country and responsibility in our hands, therefore we must dedicate our aims towards, good citizenship, steadfastness, honesty, firmness, but fairness for all, and never forget love for our truly great country and our fellowmen.

In accomplishing this, surely we will all live in peace and happiness, so we, the young citizens of today must and will let no one nor anything swerve us from our great goal.

I want to sincerely thank the American Legion—Joseph Roberts, Jr. Post No. 344 for giving me the opportunity to go to Pelican Boy's State.

MULTILATERAL AID NEEDED

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1969

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations development program has compiled an impressive record in the past decade, but now stands in peril of being unable to continue its multilateral assistance effort because of a shortage of funds.

Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, the able and dedicated administrator of the U.N. development program, has expressed the fear that a reduction in funds for the program could seriously hamper this effort to aid international development.

I should like at this time to insert into the RECORD an editorial published in the New York Times concerning the need for multilateral aid, as well as an article published in the December issue of Pre-Investment News concerning an address by Mr. Hoffman.

The editorial is first, followed by the magazine article:

[From the New York Times]

MULTILATERAL AID NEEDED

Paul G. Hoffman, apostle and long-time practitioner of international development, marked his tenth anniversary as an administrator of United Nations development efforts last week in an atmosphere of increasing gloom.

The former Marshall Plan administrator and Ford Foundation president can be proud of the accomplishments of the U.N. Development program which he heads. Of the 44 countries in which the U.N. has substantial programs, 25 can boast growth rates in excess of the 5 percent annual target. The average is a respectable 4.7 percent.

To sustain this effort, however, and to take advantage of expanding opportunities and demands for development, Mr. Hoffman believes the developed countries should double the present level of assistance. The prospects for such an increase are not good. Indeed, there is real danger of a reversal in the steady growth of development aid.

U.N.D.P. itself had projected a budget of \$200 million for the coming year, a modest increase of about \$17 million. But today, nearly two months after the annual pledging session, U.N.D.P. has still received no new commitment from its leading contributor, the United States.

The Johnson Administration, which had planned to increase its pledge to \$80 million this year, has been seriously embarrassed by Congressional cuts in the foreign aid budget. Nevertheless, funds should be found—and quickly—to sustain this vital multilateral assistance effort, at least up to last year's \$75-million level.

Continuing American delinquency threatens to undermine what has proved to be, under Mr. Hoffman's brilliant management, a remarkably successful program encouraging other nations to share more fully the burden of international development.

[From the Pre-Investment News,
December 1968]

UNDP ADMINISTRATOR PREDICTS VICTORY IN WAR ON GLOBAL WANT

A belief that the war on global want will be won and that the groundwork for this victory has already been laid, was expressed by the UNDP Administrator Paul G. Hoffman when he addressed the Second Committee (Economic and Social) of the United Nations General Assembly in New York.

He said major and relatively rapid progress could now be made against hunger, disease, ignorance, unemployment and other causes of human frustration and suffering.

These prospects should be given their due weight, since undue disillusion with the effectiveness of development aid and undue discouragement with the pace of development progress could endanger the entire development effort.

Mr. Hoffman said there was a growing realization that the responsibility for speeding development progress rested with equal weight on all countries. Poverty did not stem from a lack of natural or human resources in low income nations, but from a "great under-utilization" of these resources.

Another growing realization during the 1960's was that adequate pre-investment and technical assistance played a unique and indispensable role in the whole development process.

UNDP GROWTH

Outlining the UNDP's growth, Mr. Hoffman said that the UNDP's combined commitments for pre-investment and technical assistance had risen from \$129 million in 1959 to \$467 million in 1968. There had also been a steady increase in voluntary contributions from nations in all stages of development. These contributions had risen from \$20 million in 1950 to \$183 million in 1968.

There had been 40,000 fellowships granted for study abroad by the UNDP, and a total of 400,000 persons had been trained for essential occupations in their own countries.

As to the future role of UNDP, he said the UNDP Governing Council had begun a study to establish the size and nature of the needs of low-income countries as well as the capacity of the programme and the participating agencies to provide substantially increased services. The first phase of the study—a projection of developing countries' needs—was completed during 1967. The second phase, dealing with the capacity of the UNDP system, was now underway.

The study demonstrated with reasonable reliability the magnitude of valid needs for UNDP assistance. It also showed the need to greatly increase pre-investment and technical assistance both from the UNDP and other sources.

Analysis of countries with an annual growth rate of 5 per cent in their gross national product illustrated that the flow of external resources to these countries had been roughly twice as large as the flow to those countries with a lower growth rate. There was general agreement, he said, that all external resource flows should be doubled, as the World Bank had planned.

Because of the present leveling off of foreign aid, it was logical to assume that much of the added resources needed by low-income

nations would have to come from loans granted at normal commercial rates and from public and private investment.

GOOD MEN ARE NEEDED TO SAVE MERCHANT MARINE

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1969

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, as one who represents a leading historic maritime district of the west coast, I have been long concerned with the decline of the U.S. merchant marine. In the January issue of the National Maritime Union publication, the Pilot, there is a forthright analysis by Hoyt S. Haddock, executive director of the AFL-CIO Maritime Committee, of why this has happened. His column explains how President Johnson, despite his good intentions, has ended up with, in Mr. Haddock's words, "a sorry record of futility in maritime affairs." To avoid the same fate, Mr. Haddock believes that our new President must appoint men of stature who are dedicated to saving the U.S. merchant marine. I, for one, hope that Mr. Nixon will follow this course of action. I commend Mr. Haddock's words to the attention of all those interested in maritime affairs and include his article in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON LOOKOUT: CAN THE PRESIDENT-ELECT FORCE A BREAKTHROUGH IN MARITIME?

(By Hoyt S. Haddock)

This is being written before President-elect Nixon has announced his selection of a Secretary of Defense, Secretary of Transportation, a Maritime Administrator and other posts of power that relate directly to maritime affairs. Who these men will be and what mandate they will have under which to operate will be of paramount importance to the future of the U.S. merchant marine.

The President-elect is known to be—"determined" is the word used by a House Republican who has conferred with Mr. Nixon—to restore the American-flag merchant marine to its days of past glory. I believe, from what I know, that this is an accurate estimate.

Nevertheless, it will take competent officers and front-rank administrators of a like bent to make what is hope on Mr. Nixon's part into something resembling reality. If he does not appoint men determined to do something about the merchant marine, Mr. Nixon will end, as Mr. Johnson did, with a sorry record of utility in maritime affairs.

The case of LBJ. The example of the outgoing President is a stark case to illustrate this point. President Johnson came into office out-spokenly determined to restore our slipping merchant marine and made a notable speech to this effect in early 1965.

You know all too well what happened. Mr. Johnson's Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, did not happen to share his views. McNamara was perfectly content with such U.S. maritime-destroyers as flags-of-convenience and the effective control concept. He had no real intention of attempting to restore American-flag shipping. And his subordinates—such as Joe Califano, who later went to the White House as chief domestic troubleshooter—either shared his views or went further. Result: the Defense Department at best did nothing to strengthen the merchant marine; or, at worst, actively attempted to further weaken it, most no-

tably in its unsuccessful attempts to get Congress to approve Fast Deployment Logistic Ships.

Nick's mare's nest. Another unfortunate example is Nicholas Johnson, the then 29-year-old Texan whom President Johnson named as MARAD Administrator in 1965. With absolutely no maritime background, Nick Johnson attempted a sweeping complete reorganization of the entire U.S. maritime structure. The result was chaos and stalemate until President Johnson eased his unrelated namesake out by appointing him to the Federal Communications Commission. The entire U.S. merchant marine was set back by this appointment.

The third unhappy example is, of course, Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd. Late last year Congressional maritime leaders such as Senators Warren G. Magnuson and E. L. (Bob) Bartlett and Congressman Edward A. Garmatz got tired of waiting for the Johnson Administration to present its long-promised maritime program, and carefully drafted merchant marine revitalization legislation of their own. What is more, they did it in cooperation with Boyd and the White House in the understanding that it would have Administration backing when introduced in Congress.

Boyd's butchery. Again, you know what happened. When Boyd was called to testify on the legislation before a Senate Subcommittee last May, he marched up to Capitol Hill to denounce the bill he had reportedly helped draft in November. As a further insult, he presented a so-called Administration substitute bill that was ridiculously inadequate and non-germane to the industry's real problems. The howls of outrage and "double-cross!" that went up from maritime supporters in Congress could be heard as far away as the New York waterfront.

The result, naturally, was that nothing happened. Even though Congress contains a clear majority of merchant marine supporters, they realized it was not possible to pass the legislation under the Administration's determined opposition. Thus, the bill, which had been brought forth with brave heraldry, died a sorry whimpering death. So—thanks to his own subordinates—President Johnson's record in maritime affairs must be recorded as a significant minus.

Will the new President learn from history? Let us hope that President-elect Nixon knows and understands this recent past history when he appoints the men who will be responsible for maritime. If they do not share his stated views, good intentions and brave hopes will come to naught.

But if he does appoint people determined to revive American-flag shipping, he will find a friendly climate both on Capitol Hill and in the maritime industry to get the job done. With desperate necessity usually being the motivating force the time is now right for making such a breakthrough.

MR. GUY LINCOLN SMITH

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, during the adjournment of Congress, Tennessee suffered a great loss in the passing of the editor of the Knoxville Journal, Mr. Guy Lincoln Smith. Thus, it is only fitting that during the opening days of this new Congress we pay honor to the memory of this great Tennessean and loyal American.

Guy Smith was a hard-working leader, a well-known journalist and editor, a

friend and critic of government, a faithful citizen and dedicated American. He was a Republican and led the Republican Party as Tennessee's chairman for several years. But, he was willing and ready to counsel all who sought his advice and he kept an eye on everything the Congress did. He was our friend and our adviser.

As editor of east Tennessee's largest morning newspaper, his editorials reached a quarter of a million people and his opinions were held in high esteem for he was not afraid to point out the fallacies of our local, State, and Federal governments and his words, like his life, reflected insight, expertise, loyalty, and dedication.

The late Guy Lincoln Smith was a thinker, a planner, a leader—not a meek follower. He was a man of high ideals and with all his strength and abilities supported this democracy of ours. Our world is better for the time he spent on this earth and our loss is shared by future generations who will never have the honor to consult him, to hear or read his words of wisdom.

A NEW ERA

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the successful lunar probe by Apollo 8 has ushered in a new era in man's history—an era that will be as significant to the future of mankind as any one singular discovery in history.

There is no doubt that astronauts Col. Frank Borman, Capt. James Lovell, and Lt. Col. William Anders will be remembered in history as the original trailblazers of the mysteries of the moon.

They have captured the imagination of the world. They are, indeed, heroes. I have been privileged to visit the NASA facility and meet with our astronauts. They are great Americans. Coincidentally, Astronaut Lovell visited my district—San Marcos, Tex.—last year and captured the hearts of the people who met him because of his friendliness and gentlemanly manner.

I am pleased that our Congress in setting aside Thursday to commemorate the performance of Apollo 8, and I welcome the opportunity to express my appreciation to the world's greatest space trio.

The success of Apollo 8 has brought us to a time of reflection and a time of searching as we continue in our conquest of the unknown.

Every bit of knowledge gained by man since the beginning of time has mirrored in the success of America's latest space effort. In the past few years, we have achieved more than any time in recorded history and we now stand on the threshold of discovery that is limited only by the bounds of our capacity.

I feel that now is the time we must give our most thoughtful effort to the direction and the goals we seek beyond the limits of our world.

There is a need for serious discussion

and complex study in an attempt to forecast our course and aims.

To this end, I offer to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor which provides considerable food for thought along the lines I have mentioned:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 7, 1969]

THE MOON AND ANTARCTICA

After the lunar landing within months, what happens to the American space program? No spectacular manned flights—to Mars for instance—are scheduled after that. Very much will depend on the views of President Nixon, the mood of Congress, the verdict of the American people concerning the value of further space adventuring.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration currently is operating on an annual budget of slightly less than \$4 billion. This is down a billion and more from the earlier massive space budgets. During his campaign, Mr. Nixon said the space program was "both indispensable and of major importance to our country." Since the election, his science adviser, Dr. Lee DuBridge, has said that NASA should be allowed to proceed with those spacehips and rockets already on order. He didn't say much about ordering new hardware for manned flights following the moon landing.

We believe that the American space program should receive steady support, but we also recognize that, right now, there are also priorities right here on earth—the problem of poverty, the plight of the city cores—which require strong and consistent funding. The space program should proceed at moderate speed, so that compelling earth-based needs can be handled at high speed.

This will not mean a dormant space program. NASA has projects ahead for instruments probes of Mars and Venus. They are not supercostly. After the moon landings (three in all), NASA will use the leftover rockets and spacecraft in what is called the Apollo Applications Program. This will include an earth-orbiting space station, and probably an eventual laboratory or station on the moon.

Meanwhile the United States Air Force will be busy with earth orbital missions, looking to the development of effective observational satellites and other items of military significance.

Would it not be possible, as America's eventual space aim, to see the moon treated much as Antarctica today is treated? That is to say, as a "continent" where nationality does not play a significant role. There could be a research station on the moon, manned the year around—not merely by Americans but by invitation to the scientists and technicians of other interested nations. And particularly the Soviets.

This would be an effective means of lifting mankind's sights beyond the ancient rivalries of earth.

FRANCE: FAITHLESS ALLY AND BETRAYER OF ISRAEL

HON. BERTRAM L. PODELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1969

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, I observed with astonishment and dismay the action taken by De Gaulle's France in imposing a total embargo on spare parts and weapons for Israel. In light of the well-known fact that Israel's Armed Forces are mainly French in origin as far as equipment

is concerned, this is a harsh glow, indeed. Surely the perfidy of the De Gaulle regime is cause for all freedom-loving Frenchmen to hang their heads in utter shame.

Is this the France of the Cross of Lorraine? Is it the France of Diderot? Of Montesquieu? Of Voltaire? Of Rousseau? Of Victor Hugo? Is this the France of the Tennis Court Oath? Or the France that has bled whenever freedom was at stake? Is this the France that sent a thrill of joy throughout the world when she brought an honorable finish to the shame of Dreyfus?

Does not Emile Zola's spirit and that of Clemenceau writhe in spiritual agony at the sight of their France—beloved France—selling their birthright for the favor of Arab despots?

How incredible. How degrading. How disgusting.

Here is the sight of a Biblical people, driven, despoiled, and ravaged for 20 centuries. After all the destruction visited upon them by generations of hatred, they saw it culminate in the utter carnage and horror of the Hitlerian era. Who can ever forget the agonies we all felt as the fruits of genocide were revealed. The Jews are the only people on our globe who have had visited upon them this practice.

But France also felt the heel of the Nazi jackboot. France was tormented for over 4 years by the brutality of the SS, Gestapo, and the vagaries of Himmler's desires. France sent her sons to feed the Nazi maw. France was pillaged and degraded by the occupation. Under the Arch of Triumph marched the German legions. Upon Napoleon's tomb Hitler gazed with unholy glee. At Compiègne he danced his jig of victory in the virtual shadow of Marshal Foch's railroad carriage.

Is the memory of France so short? Is her conscience so dead? Are there no Zolas in France today? Is there no justice in French hearts? Shall honest Frenchmen stand by and allow their government to perpetrate such an unconscionable outrage upon Israel?

Israel was founded as a refuge. Israel is a few thousand square miles of pitiful dirt and desert, made to flower by loving hands and toll of refugees from tyranny. She is defended by people who have no option but survival or annihilation. De Gaulle knows all this full well.

The Israelis have thrice turned the dreams of dictators into the ashes of defeat. Thrice she has been faced with the threat of annihilation. Thrice she has risen in righteous defense of her right to live. Thrice she has carried the banners of David to a triumph for democracy.

Israel is the living embodiment of ideals great Frenchmen have lived and died for on battlefields and barricades. Since the founding of Israel, France has often lived up to her beliefs by aiding her in her fight for survival. In return, Israel has kept the light of western democracy and civilization aglow in the Middle East. All efforts of Nasser and his Soviet allies have failed to extinguish it.

But now Israel is beset once again from all sides by assassins who strike in the night, and foes who threaten her fron-

tiers. When she bleeds and strikes out at her tormenters, she does so in righteous wrath and self-defense.

The differences are striking. The Fedeyeen kill an Israeli with an act of piracy at an international airport in Athens. Just as they sought to prevent her from using sealanes in international commerce, so they seek to do the same for her right to use international airlines.

In response, Israel strikes in Lebanon, insuring that no civilians are injured. The world rises in shrieking indignation at a convenient target. Not the Arabs who murdered, but the Israelis who retaliated.

This is the excuse De Gaulle's France now uses to deprive Israel of a supply of weapons, spare parts, and munitions. This is how she seeks to bare Israel naked to those who wait like slaving wolves to rend and tear and murder.

It was not enough for France to accept payment for airplanes from Israel and then fail to deliver them. It was not enough to take the side of Arab primitives who live and think in the style of the Middle Ages. It was not enough to bare France's nudity of conscience when the scales held an oil concession and Jewish lives. Now De Gaulle perpetrates this fresh atrocity.

De Gaulle's France is America's enemy. She has betrayed and injured the United States just as she seeks to betray and injure Israel. She drove us from our NATO bases, seeking to destroy that instrument of deterrence to Soviet aggression. She blithely tests hydrogen weapons, seeking to pollute our environment and play the deadly international game of nuclear politics.

She attacks the American dollar, then crawls back on her belly, crying for us to salvage what is left of the value of her franc.

She ignores her debts of wars of the past to us, forgetting even the moral obligation she owes this Nation and England. Her President delivers a deadly insult to our country by dishonoring celebrations at Normandy of the invasion of Hitler's Festung Europa. De Gaulle did not even deign to honor thousands of dead Americans who lie buried above the beaches there.

She stirs up the sleeping horrors of French nationalism in Canada by interfering in the internal life of a sovereign state which has gone to her defense in two world wars.

She lies like a dog in the European manger, refusing entry into the Common Market to England, who bled for her, helped free her, and seeks to enter peacefully into a European economic union. It is perhaps the last best hope for a cure to the disease of European nationalism that has twice almost destroyed the world.

She sits today as the very negation of what her democratic tradition has always stood for. She stands forth today as a nation that eagerly cavorts by the side of any despot, be they Arab or anti-American, or Soviet, if there is harm to be done to our country, so to be gotten for her frustrated ego, or a franc or two to be turned.

As we have sought to unravel the Vietnam puzzle, suffering our own agonies there, De Gaulle's France has smugly sat on the sidelines, enjoying our discomfiture, and cheering on those who daily shed the blood of our beloved sons. Forgetting all the while that France's benighted colonialism and naked imperialism were prime causes of that entire situation to begin with.

We entered the Vietnam quagmire because of her botching of a war that she created through brutal exploitation and gross incompetence.

I state here and now that it is time for the United States of America to give the back of its hand to De Gaulle's France in no uncertain terms. It is time we stand up and show our contempt for her actions and our intention to frustrate her drives. Millions of Americans would applaud such activity.

Shall we allow this third-rate power, led by an aging egomaniac who thinks in 19th-century terms, to gore us and place a tiny democratic state in the path of immediate disaster?

Shall we not show our displeasure as citizens and as a body which has some alternatives as far as our Nation's policy toward France are concerned? Certainly, it is my intention to do so. Certainly, French actions shall not be forgotten in times to come.

It is my enduring hope that the spirit of a different France will emerge. It is my deep desire to see the spirit of the France I have loved come to the fore and seek to do justice as in the past. It is my hope that the memory and spirit of Captain Dreyfus will sit and walk and lie by General de Gaulle from this instant on. May he be joined by the spirits of those Israelis who have been foully murdered by Arab assassins striking from the night. May they be joined by the spirits of those American soldiers who sleep in French soil, and who De Gaulle showed contempt for.

From this reaction may the sleeping spirit of a democratic France bring back to life the ideas and actions that will redress these evils. For the conscience of France I wish it.

Every Israeli who dies because of France's action will lie like a curse and a weight upon the pages of France's history in ages yet to come. It is my hope that my message, which I know others shall concur in, reaches the appropriate people.

Mr. Speaker, in times to come France will have dire need of this country's good will. Even now her military gazes with desire at American nuclear armament. There will be many opportunities to strike at her vitals. It is my intention to see to it that these options are exercised in times to come. It is further my intention to see to it that anti-French activities in this country are intensified, and the summary I have delivered disseminated throughout this Nation. It is my intention to do this ceaselessly, sleeplessly, untiringly, inexorably.

I accuse France, just as Clemenceau accused her government, of anti-Semitism, anti-Israeli actions founded on the basis of motives.

GENERATING GREATNESS BY UNDERSTANDING

HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, on October 9, 1968, Mr. Marvin Hurley, executive vice president of the Houston Chamber of Commerce, delivered a speech entitled "Generating Greatness by Understanding—the Past" to the 54th annual management conference of the American Chamber of Commerce Executives. This speech puts our urban problems into focus and it is worth the attention of every Member of this body:

GENERATING GREATNESS BY UNDERSTANDING—THE PAST

(By Marvin Hurley)

This age has imposed upon us the task of re-thinking our nature and our role in civilization. We are experiencing what appears to be a conspiracy against reality. We are caught up in a wave of insistent demand to cure every conceivable evil, either real or imagined, right now. We demand instant magic. Since this is not possible, a spirit of pessimism prevails. The protestors, the activists, the nihilists are the newsmakers.

But any concept that we are helpless victims of a sick society, the powerless pawns of a vicious system, is alien to our history and traditions and foreign to the facts. We are not at the mercy of inexorable trends and super-human social forces as we frequently hear our urban perplexities described. We are merely paying the penalty of a lack of understanding on the part of our society and a failure to anticipate problems and solve them before they reached the emergency stage. We need perspective.

This is particularly significant to us because our work brings us into the very mainstream of the great currents of human development that are sweeping over the world. There are tides of change that are creating turmoil in our society today that practically demand new dimensions for Chambers of Commerce and for individual effort. We are in a continuing battle with obsolescence.

In our professional responsibilities as managers, we have been slow to recognize that a scientific and technological age has erupted and that it is irresistibly urban. Our understanding of the implications of urbanism for modern society has been inadequate. The mounting evidence that the city is the primary agent in man's culture and civilization has met with resistance.

At least some of the conditions with which we are now struggling might not have developed if we had been more professionally effective, but many of them resulted from conditions beyond our influence. I am convinced that if there had been no Chambers of Commerce, we would be sunk more deeply in the quagmire of troubles than we are today. Yet, the American public does not give us credit for the role we do play in urban affairs. It concerns me that in a search I made in preparation for these remarks, in some 25 books and perhaps 100 articles on the urban situation, I found only isolated references to Chambers of Commerce.

But, let me get the record straight. I offer no apologies for our performance. I find much basis for pride in the record of Chambers of Commerce. I would hate to see us engage in the nonsense of self-reproach and self-ridicule or to permit a guilt complex to envelop our profession. There are some critics

who would have us plead guilty to mass ineptness. This is ridiculous. By nature, we are doers and not worriers, and we can take pride in our achievements. We are not infallible, but we should always be willing to explore our shortcomings and failures and try to correct them.

So, this morning, in this review, I find no reason to think of the past as a chamber of horrors. As a matter of fact, I have spent most of my life in the past, and I rather like much of what I have seen and what I have experienced. The past, of course, has lessons for us. We can ignore them, or we can profit from them. If we ignore them, though, the chances are we will keep on making the same mistakes. Thus, a little analysis of our past performance may be a worthwhile exercise in generating greatness this morning.

We have been experiencing a process of social change in this country that is so infinitely complex and varied that we have become confused and frustrated. Many forces have been at work in the interaction of social change, and our responsibilities involve us in most of them. Passing over the urban problem and the race issue for the moment, let me indicate some of the basic trends of recent years that have influenced our work, but which we may have been slow to recognize.

We have reached an affluence unprecedented by world standards, but it has not alleviated our personal and public economic problems.

Governmental policies and other influences have moderated the business cycle and have given us a new and perhaps false sense of economic stabilization.

Education is having a new impact on social change, both in material terms and in patterns of living and thinking; but we are still searching for educational objectives appropriate to our time in history.

Increasing affluence and rising educational levels are altering attitudes toward work and seem to be eroding some of our traditional work values without providing any acceptable alternatives.

Developments in communication and transportation are increasing and strengthening the interdependence of our governmental, economic and non-profit institutions, both domestically and internationally.

After almost a century of an industrial society in this country, following two and a half centuries of an agricultural society, we now seem to be in the early stages of a post-industrial society, built around services and knowledge.

With near-instant sight and sound rapidly abolishing the barriers of time and space, we have created a world neighborhood, but we share it with ideological strangers.

For the first time in history, we, as well as other major powers, hold in our hands the power to destroy our civilization.

History offers us a degree of consolation by reminding us that problems have flourished in every age. As we make the transition now into a new social and economic world, in a period of revolutionary scientific and technological change, we are reminded that every generation tends to think it has inherited the worst problems of any age.

If we are to have a clear and fruitful understanding of our responsibilities as Chamber of Commerce managers, we need to clarify and reformulate our expectations, concepts and assumptions about our society and our communities. During periods of uncertainty, people have a tendency to accept faulty assumptions as facts and then to use them as a basis for propounding theories. Our work demands that we be more objective and more analytical.

This year, we have been observing the 200th anniversary of the Chamber of Commerce movement in America. Our organizations have operated in cities throughout the urban history of this country. Obviously, there have been failures along the line. Certainly we have created no urban utopias.

This morning, I am afraid that both we and our society stand convicted by circumstantial evidence of some significant failures.

It concerns me when our national Congress has found it necessary to sit with armed regulars manning machine guns on the Capitol steps in a city smoldering from the fires of a week end of senseless destruction; and especially since this is not an isolated experience.

It concerns me that our streets are clogged with traffic, our air is laden with filth and fumes, our water is soiled with wastes, our landscape is desecrated with ugliness, and our youngsters are having their minds poisoned with psychological pollution.

It concerns me that so many of our citizens are so apathetic that they prefer to sit comfortably in the box-seats of indifference while their future is being decided on the playing field of public affairs.

It concerns me that support is growing for the theory that only those who want to work should have to work; and that those who do not want to work have an intrinsic right to food, clothing, shelter, medical care, education and the other essentials of a good life without the necessity of being socially useful.

It concerns me that there is so much emphasis today in entertainment, art and literature on the lowest forms of human appeal, with sexual immorality being defended by intellectuals and excused by semi-religionists; and that the "new left" movement would convert our college campuses into sanctuaries to counsel sedition, treason and other intentional invasions of the rights of other people.

It concerns me that the principle of civil disobedience is being perverted to justify various types of invasion of the rights of other citizens; that we have become so indulgent in excusing deliberate violations of the law in the name of lofty causes that we are entirely too tolerant of violence as a method of social protest; and that the forgotten man in the halls of justice seems to be the so-called ordinary citizen.

It concerns me that allegiance is growing for the basic premises of anarchism: for a stateless society without government, without law, and without ownership of property—for the theory that the end justifies the means; that we make progress by changing the social structure through political power and social pressures rather than by changing the hearts of men and women; and that violent revolution may be necessary to overthrow society and make way for a better world.

It concerns me that the Puritan ethic which served the pioneer period of our nation so well is being replaced by "situation ethics"—by the theory that the circumstances of each situation determine the principle rather than applying eternal moral principles to a situation.

It concerns me that so many of our old moralities and ancient values are losing their credibility and that our American way of life is being painted as a fraud and a cheat.

It concerns me that a gloomy spirit of despair prevails so generally over our people and that brash, frustrated and iconoclastic young professors in our colleges, universities and seminars are telling our young people that America has been in the hands of charlatans for generations.

We have not understood the underlying causes of these conditions as well as we should; and our performance in the presence of such conditions has not always measured up to the high standards we must have for professional competence.

Too often, we have been technicians in our work rather than professionals and have tried to cope with revolutionary trends while still limited by superficial understanding.

We have concerned ourselves with events and current conditions without understanding the longer-range trends that create con-

ditions which erupt into even more serious events.

We have failed to enlist the talent available in our communities to help us recognize and analyze basic trends influencing our programs; and we have failed to understand the counteractions—the long-range strategy—and to use early-warning that comes from analysis and understanding.

We have busied ourselves with the petty larceny of daily minutiae without doing an adequate job of problem analysis that becomes increasingly necessary in this age of dynamic change.

We have failed to recognize the growing interdependence of problems and opportunities in our communities; the growing interrelationships of institutions, conditions and influences on a regional, or broader, basis; and the need for intercommunication essential for human understanding.

We have found ourselves with too little, too late, for a future that showed up ahead of schedule—a revolutionary new age brought on by science and technology, by the automobile, industrialization, urbanization, mobility and rapid growth.

We have suffered our cities to remain saddled with outmoded political structures and patterns during a time when problems and needs increasingly ignore the artificiality of governmental jurisdictions and archaic systems.

We have permitted the taxing structure of local government to become so restrictive that it lacks the flexibility demanded by the growing responsibilities of this age.

When the federal government has moved into the voids left by local government, our community leadership has had a tendency to defect and leave the initiative to Washington bureaucrats.

Our knowledge has not kept pace with our responsibilities, and we have not developed nor utilized adequate opportunities for continuing education for essential personal development.

Although we should accept the fact of our own failures in the past, we must recognize that we share responsibilities with others, including the people themselves, business and industry, and our community leaders. Let me elaborate.

The strength of our communities rests with our people and the effectiveness of our programs depends upon the quality and participation of our people. A program of total community development must be concerned with the welfare, understanding, participation and opinions of all the people of the community.

In comparison to those of past generations, our people today are reasonably qualified for their citizenship participation. But, at the same time, they have failed to keep pace with the growing responsibilities that citizenship in our present complex age requires.

The average American today is younger than before, under 27 years of age. Since more of his time has been spent in school, he is less experienced. He has the equivalent of a high school education, but unfortunately, he let his education end there. Now he devotes two-and-a-half hours each day to watching television—but not educational television. He reads his local newspaper and a few popular magazines, but not the mind-stretching articles, and he practically never reads a book. He is more interested in sports than he is in social trends and political issues, is not much concerned about heaven or hell, and has lost confidence in the honesty of public officials.

Art Lumsden mentioned a significant fact about people in the recent issue of the Journal—that "we have been unwilling to bury the agrarian myth and accept our role as an urban nation". The truth is, our people do not like cities and never have. The European tradition is essentially urban, but when our forefathers came to America they seemed to

drop the European affection for the city. To avoid cities, our forefathers pushed west until they ran out of frontier—then we started pushing out into the suburbs. The conflict between the core city and the suburbs is but a more recent manifestation of the rural-urban conflict that has become a part of our national tradition.

Part of the early urban allergy resulted from wide open space in pioneer America and part was due to our frontier tradition. It has been difficult for us to get away from the frontier concept of America as an agrarian paradise. We have been slow to accept the belief that cities are really the heart of democracy. Politicians listen to the "grass roots", and our image of the typical American is a farmer with sweat in his face in the finest tradition. City people still rush off to the country at every opportunity. They think they need this return to rural realities to pamper their shattered nerves before plunging back into another week of the turmoil and chaos of city life.

Acceptance of our urban role has been agonizingly slow in coming. In 1890, the Bureau of the Census announced to an unsuspecting, totally unready and highly unconcerned nation that the geographical frontier had disappeared. Save by a handful of intellectuals, this announcement went totally unheeded. Then in 1904, Teddy Roosevelt was elected, and for the first time in our history it was the urban vote that had put a man into the White House. Again the significance of this development went without notice.

It was not until the current decade that we began to restructure our legislatures in line with the urban age. It was not until this decade that urban America was recognized at the cabinet level in our national government. It was not until this decade that general interest in urban America began to develop. More urban books have been published in this decade than in all our prior history.

For the first time, colleges and universities are establishing centers of urban studies, but they are being used primarily to supplement professional salaries and to strengthen graduate programs. The colleges and universities of the land still offer a half dozen courses with a rural orientation to every one with an urban orientation.

The research and development program of this country aggregates in excess of \$25 billion annually, but only pennies are being devoted to urban research and to the exploration of human relations. We have spent scores of times as much on an early warning system to alert us of approaching enemy planes or missiles as we have on an early warning system to alert us of the approach of urban crises. Our work has been handicapped by the failure to develop a 20th century enlightenment about urban living to replace the 19th century concept that was shaped to a rural pattern.

People need to accept cities as a more vital part of the American idea of what life is all about. The geographical frontier has ceased to be our challenge. The persistence of the city as a form of corporate life is evidence that urban living offers what people need, want, and continue to seek. The city is now our frontier. It is our national challenge. The promise of the city is great, and the delivery on this promise is the challenge for people working through Chambers of Commerce along the cutting edge of the new urban frontier. They need a better understanding of city problems in order to view them more sensibly and in perspective.

Business and industry only in recent years are beginning to recognize their role in urban affairs. They have exploited a corporate device created by government to generate explosive technological change. Radical technological advance is always followed by social change. In a democracy, people demand that the impact of this social change be alleviated

in some way. Not until recent years, however, have the leaders of business and industry been willing to accept significant responsibility for the social changes resulting from the technological advances caused by their use of the corporate device.

Therefore, people looked increasingly to government. It has operated on the theory that if we subsidized a problem, we would not have to solve it. It has been trying to redistribute wealth rather than opportunity. For a generation, government has been seeking with growing insistency the answer to urban dilemmas. It sought, however, with faltering success to do the whole job, but now it is accepting the fact that the total resources of the country must be brought to bear upon urban life. American business only in the last few years has been concerned that a crisis of inaction has become a threat to our cities. Businessmen are realizing now that it is time to quit complaining about our dependence on federal funding. It is time to quit trying to push responsibility to others. It is time for all resources to combine in broader action programs in the problem areas.

Although public affairs today commands top management attention, the subject is still a relatively new entry in the corporate manual. The National Industrial Conference Board has found that business interest in public affairs as a corporate activity has increased significantly in recent years. This new interest encompasses government relations, employee political activity, political and economic education, community service and environmental problems. This socio-economic interest includes air and water pollution, vocational training of displaced and unskilled workers, education and law enforcement.

Increasingly, we have to look to businessmen for the leadership to provide the vision, the initiative and the experience to cope with our urban problems. Such leadership is now generally available when there is confidence in the importance of the work and when there is conviction that time is not being wasted.

Businessmen have unusual understanding for long-range planning. They need only to apply to the community the same principles they have used increasingly in their corporate operations for many years. They know that in the main the people who are going to influence our communities through the balance of this century are alive today. They know that most of what we will experience in this period is already under way either in practice, or inherent in laboratory models and legislative plans, or in the social trends and experiments within our society.

Another concept of our concern about understanding in the past rests with the quality of the leadership with which we have worked. The matter of leadership recruitment and development is a growing responsibility with Chambers of Commerce. We need to sharpen our definition of leadership in these complex times. Conditions demand more and better leaders, but they are being drawn from an age group that represents a declining ratio in our population. Depression babies are coming increasingly into the leadership market, and we generated a limited numerical inventory of potential leaders during the depression years.

We have found that the task of marshaling community leadership to address common goals or purposes for the community is not always an easy one. Community leaders have the freedom to participate, or to refrain from participating, for any purpose that may motivate them. There are no simple checks and balances for marshaling community leadership. Much of the current social turmoil in the country today undoubtedly is a direct result of failure to marshal and to challenge the right kinds of leadership at the community level.

It is relatively easy to enlist leadership for dramatic solutions to pressing emergencies

on a current basis. It is far more difficult to enlist leadership for long-range efforts on mundane goals growing out of social trends. Still, one of our failures has resulted from our unwillingness to accept the challenges and hard work of dealing with the future and to plan on the basis of what today's trends and other indicators forecast for the next generation.

Thus, what we really want, and need most, are pressure-free leaders—those who can rally groups, motivate individuals, and generate active and enthusiastic participation by others without being pushed by the pressures of emergency conditions. There is no question about the importance of day-to-day operations, but it is even more important to be taking steps to meet the needs of the next generation.

Time perspective is important in any consideration of community leaders and in the response of people to leaders. Herein lies the importance of maturity of leadership. The immature leader looks only to immediate success of projects, immediate solutions to problems, or immediate gratification of desires. But the mature leader can project his thinking to the mission of long-range planning and can broaden his perspective to consider major factors that may influence a project. He is more able to accommodate delays in goal achievement, to understand the reasons for the delays, and to live with the realities that are involved. The mature, intelligent leader knows that the needs for the future cannot be wholly gratified by immediate actions. However, he recognizes the need to keep moving in the direction of right goals and to adapt to identifiable long-range trends.

There are two types of community leaders which we may categorize as the "localite" and the "cosmopolite". The localite tends to have a narrow focus, to be comfortably settled in the narrow sphere of his own restricted interests. He does not like to be disturbed in the comfort of his simplistic ideas. Therefore, he is not receptive to change, and he usually does only the minimum expected of him in community participation. The cosmopolite, on the other hand, can project outside his own sphere. He has a broader view, wider interests, and more vision. He relates more to the world at large, to broader view, wider interests, and more vision. He relates more to the world at large to broader issues and trends, and characteristically is more inclined to accept innovation. He understands that communication, mobility, business expansion and other circumstances combine to internationalize today's cities. Hardly anybody lives where he was born. The modern leader changes locations many times, and community allegiance is not what it used to be. Motivation for participation must come from other sources.

But lest you think I am passing the entire burden for past failures along to people, to business and industry, and to community leaders, let me turn the spotlight on us as Chamber of Commerce managers. We are in no position to elevate geological specimens of criticism against others as long as we live in the glass house of vulnerability that we do.

We must take our share of the blame for the failures of the past. We have not qualified ourselves with an adequate program of continuing education. We have been negligent in our concern about trends that could affect our communities and derelict in our efforts to understand these trends and to bring about action in response to them. The trends lose meaning if they are not examined in relation to an environment that has been projected into the future. We have not thought sufficiently in terms of total community development and total involvement of the people of the community. We have not engaged sufficiently in long-range planning to avoid the development of crises in our communities. We have not recognized

the implications of the growing area aspect of local problems.

We have not demonstrated the quality of judgment that the importance of our position in the community requires. Although our responsibilities are heavy, we are neither a dictator nor a messiah in our communities. There have been times when we have assumed so much personal responsibility that we have tried to make all the decisions, clear away the underbrush, smooth the road, and take our leaders by the hand and lead them like zombies—protecting them from mistakes but depriving them of either experience or contribution. We have discouraged the full use of their intelligence, initiative and innovation. Neither the whole of truth nor the whole of good is revealed to any manager. It is not necessary for us to be omniscient and set our members to dancing in the streets to measure up to our responsibilities.

We have been too inclined, also, at times, to sway with each change of the social, economic or political wind. Today, the priority concern is socio-economic; but it is not the only concern. Down through the years, too many of us have been inclined to go all out with the current trend of public interest and neglect other implications of a total community development program. Years ago, the big thrust was to build "roads that go somewhere", then the battle for smokestacks began. In the early 1940's, we went all out for the war effort, as well we should; but more far-sighted managers at the same time were busy with postwar plans.

And thus we have swung from one trend to another, ignoring the lessons of experience and the examples of history. Our hot item now for pressure merchandising is the socio-economic problem. My only counsel in this connection is that we do our part of this job, and do it well, but that we not overlook the fact that it is but one manifestation of more sweeping trends that should be of grave concern to us. Man does not live by environment alone any more than he lives by bread alone. We cannot ignore socio-economic concerns, but neither can we close our eyes to the other responsibilities inherent in our type of community service.

Some have failed, too, because of their allegiance to the status quo—to their reluctance to crawl out of the comfort of their favorite rut and innovate. While innovation can be carried to an extreme, we know full well that community progress can never be constructively generated by efforts to smother originality, to crush initiative or to wipe out individuality. Of course, we have some who go to the other extreme, those who make changes only for the sake of making changes. To believe that the solution to every problem lies in something different is to believe in a myth.

Regardless of the dimensions and rates of change, there will always be situations in which there will be a vital need to deter change and to preserve certain values and conditions which we need, or enjoy, or which influence our lives and welfare.

Will and Ariel Durant have said: "The conservative who resists change is as valuable as the radical who proposes it—perhaps as much more valuable as roots are more vital than grafts. It is good that new ideas should be heard, for the sake of the few that can be used; but it is also good that new ideas should be compelled to go through the mill of objection, opposition, and contumely; this is the trial heat which innovations must survive before being allowed to enter the human race."

There are times, though, when conditions reach the point that we have to be ready for operating on a crash basis. Human nature seems so constituted that it takes crises periodically to generate progress. It seems that events have to deteriorate at times into emergencies before we can focus public attention on them, and arouse essential public

action. The Supreme Planner of the Universe seems to have given human beings the ability to use afflictions for the testing and strengthening of their virtues. There seems, then, to be a fortunate as well as an unfortunate relationship between crisis situations and progress.

The greatest upsurges of change generally occur under the pressures of emergency conditions, but we should recognize that there is always a high risk in this process. When we move under the pressure of crisis, we run the serious risk of effecting permanent changes which cannot be undone if they prove to be wrong—or if they can be undone, it may be only with critical penalties in costs and human effort. The course of social change is seldom swift or simple.

Our main problem has been our failure to understand negative trends that may create problems in our communities and positive trends which if not recognized and acted upon may be lost beyond recall. Let us take, for example, the race issue. Factors that combined to explode in racial strife have been developing for generations. At the close of the Civil War, steps were not taken to integrate the black man into our society. With the coming of the agricultural revolution, more products were produced on fewer acres by fewer people, and rural Negroes were largely displaced from the land. They started moving to town, and more especially to the larger cities of the North.

The trend became clearer as more Negroes achieved a better standard of living, a higher level of education, and a greater exercise of their right to vote. During the period of World War II, hundreds of thousands of young Negroes experienced a way of life that traditionally had been denied them. Increasing mobility added to this understanding after the war. Slowly, the black man realized that his rate of improvement was not keeping pace with the progress of his rising expectations. He became increasingly concerned over the day-to-day petty humiliations white men traditionally had inflicted upon black people by insinuations and condescensions. As a growing factor in our society, the black man became more insistent on a role in decision-making processes.

Thus we have watched the development among black people of a black consciousness and a black pride, a new sense of unity, a new feeling of political power, and a growing demand for a part of the action. The burden weighed increasingly heavy upon white men and black men alike to find meaningful relationships among the races. The granting of formal rights accomplished little without a spirit of acceptance to make those rights meaningful.

The goal of equality will not be reached by thinking that riots are unavoidable or that they will cease when every Negro wrong has been righted and when every white heart has been cleansed of prejudice and selfishness. Likewise, it is as much a mistake to think that all blacks are militants as it is for all whites to suffer a mass guilt complex for centuries of conditions for which they had no part. This is important when we realize that blacks will be in the majority of 14 of our major cities in ten years.

More recently we have failed to acknowledge the growing ambivalence among Negroes that is creating a great deal of confusion both within the black community itself and with those segments of the white community that are attempting to relate to the blacks. This revolves around the difference between the ethnic concept and the socio-economic concepts. The two currents are symbolized but oversimplified by the labels of "separatists" and "integrationists".

We have failed also to realize that the race problem is linked closely with the wave of anti-colonialism that has swept the world in this generation. We have failed further to recognize the affinities of the style and thought of the black militants, the New Left,

the hippies, and student protestors with the Anarchistic movement which swept the world during the period of the international labor uprising.

The insignificant numerical ratio of active dissidents in our population is no justification for complacency. We cannot afford to ignore the same type of irrational fervor that has enabled small minorities in the past to ignite successful revolutions in other countries. We cannot afford to ignore the possibility that a Marx or a Lenin or a Hitler may be moving in and out of today's activist groups. Our civilization has no more lease on life than any of those of the past that have fallen because they could not see or cope with their problems in time.

I have gone into this detail on the race issue merely to illustrate the importance of an understanding of developing trends. There are other trends taking shape at this moment that may even now be creating problems that will plague us in the future. For example, we are already seeing the reversal of the trend of the past generation toward centralization. A monolithic government just has not worked well in a democracy. In dealing with the rate and scope of today's change, and its resulting social problems, we have to have the flexibility and variety of both response and initiative that can be found only in more decentralization. The importance of the individual's role in the social structure is being strengthened by this new trend.

We are also beginning to realize that we have been pursuing a false urban god in our efforts to create models of utopian cities. We are tackling many of the problems of our cities as never before, but we are not yet clear as to what kind of a city we want or the means by which our aspirations can be realized. We must have some idea of what we want the urban environment to be so we can better evaluate events and circumstances today and make right decisions. We have to be especially careful because the ills of a city are often interwoven with its strengths. Dream cities have been designed by past generations, but they were never built. They probably would not have worked if they had been built. No established model or master plan can be designed to meet the changing conditions and shifting technologies of the future. Urban renewal, we are beginning to realize, is a process and not a goal—an interdisciplinary process. Or, as Dr. Constantinos Doxiadis says, "We can never finalize our views about the complicated and evolving phenomena of human settlements. The best we can do is to study them continuously."

We are only beginning to appreciate the "systems" character of the city and the need for an interdisciplinary approach to urban planning. Planning first of all is for people—not for structures, land use, or other planners. Planning must reflect the way people actually want to live and not the way some ivory-towered expert thinks they should live. The plethora of self-appointed urban experts who are writing books and making speeches and putting together TV specials, for the most part, have never experienced the practical implementation of urban programs. In their Olympian self-assurance, they remind me of the man who read 20 books on swimming and promptly drowned the first time he got into deep water. We are victims of statistical extrapolators who magnify gloomy trends into vistas of disaster. They foster paralysis of the human will by the sheer massiveness of their predicted despair. Most of them seem to get up on the wrong side of the world every morning.

The computer for the first time has given us the means to examine urban systems in their full technological and humanistic sophistication and interrelationships. To find solutions to our complex and interrelated problems, we are going to have to draw upon data processing and the systems approach of the type that management technical groups have developed in our missile and space pro-

grams to handle the volumes of information that are involved.

In this connection, I would like to raise one storm warning, though; a fact about systems analysis that we should understand. There is no way today that systems analysis can develop optimum solutions for urban problems purely by the processes of deductive reasoning and cost-benefit evaluations. Efficiency and economy are worthwhile goals, but they have to be conditioned by other values—human values and political realities. For example, it will continue to be a problem as how best to spend the scarce resources of a community—whether to build a road or a school, an airport or a hospital, a jail or a garden. Such choices cannot be computerized, although I believe there will be a growing role for data processing in meeting urban needs.

It is relatively easy to plan physical beauty or the amenities of variety for our cities, but they will never come into reality if the public is unwilling to pay for them. Yet it is ridiculous to try to create an ideal image of a city by the statistics of sampling. It is not possible to create a model of a great city by patching together the bits and pieces of fragmentary images already existing in the minds of people who have never experienced a good environment. But we still have to know what our people will support. Basically, whether an urban area expands and improves, or withers and declines, depends on its ability to create wealth. But, in long-range planning, we have to remember, as Heilbroner has suggested, that there is a calculus of humanity as well as a calculus of economics.

Our urban concern today does not mean that problems of the city are new or that we cannot meet their challenge; but rather that we have a greater social consciousness and are seeking higher standards of urban living. Mankind has always had problems. There has always been urban blight. Problems of pollution, health conditions, traffic congestion, and violence are not new. Cities have long been accustomed to the coexistence of poverty and disorder along with extremes of wealth and luxurious living. But, today, we are more aware of these contrasts and more concerned about human wastage and defeat. Today, because of a developing social consciousness, we find evidence of civic decay more intolerable than ever before. This new consciousness is increasingly impatient with public failure to cope with existing social conditions and to provide what is reasonable for human conservation.

Urban historians can demonstrate many ways in which our cities are better than ever before. But we expect more of our cities. The plain truth is that our understanding of causal relationships in the social system and in the urban system is still rudimentary. The state of our theoretical knowledge about social causality is probably comparable to the state of the medical arts during colonial times . . . and, so, unfortunately, may be some of our diagnoses and projections. Informed and interested and dedicated citizens can press for policies and programs to deal with our socio-economic problems on a sound basis. This is the payoff of trend identification.

There are times, though, when we feel that human nature thrives only on crisis and feeds only on violence. Every age has had its prophets of doom. The end of the world has been forecast in every generation. And, we have our share of the exponents of despair today. We tend to consider it normal for a spirit of pessimism to prevail. But, by what inflation of the vanity do we think we are the generation chosen to see the end of the world that was born 4,500 million years ago; that we are to watch the dying throes of human beings created ten million years ago; that we are to observe the final convulsions of civilization dating back 40,000 years; and that we are to preside over the dissolution of

an economic and political system that came into flower two centuries ago? Such an attitude is born of conceit and nourished on arrogance.

Our society, our nation and our economy are fundamentally sound. Instinctively we feel our basic strength. The American people have an inherent commitment to steady progress, and that commitment will continue to propel this country forward. Fundamental forces are at work in our society. We are in the midst of a long but fast-moving historical evolution. It has had setbacks, but the inevitable movement is forward.

Between now and the year 2,000, we will see history's most exciting, most fearful, and yet most hopeful period. The future offers challenge and promise. The frontier of the future is urban. I believe it will be the verdict of history that here in this closing third of the 20th century, we in Chamber of Commerce management met our greatest challenge and responded successfully with strength, foresight and courage—generating greatness through understanding.

BEATRICE FOX AUERBACH DIES

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1969

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, while the Congress was in adjournment, one of the leading citizens of Connecticut, Mrs. Beatrice Fox Auerbach, died in Hartford. She was 81 years old.

Mrs. Auerbach was a leading figure in civic, social, and business life. I offer for the RECORD, comments which appeared on television, in the Connecticut Jewish Ledger and in the Hartford Courant and the Hartford Times paying tribute to this remarkable woman:

[From the Connecticut Jewish Ledger]

MRS. BEATRICE FOX AUERBACH DIES AT 81—
HEADED G. FOX & CO.

HARTFORD.—Mrs. Beatrice Fox Auerbach, for 29 years president of G. Fox & Co. and a civic, business and communal leader of international repute, died at Hartford Hospital last Friday night. She was 81 years old.

Tributes poured in from local and state leaders who cited Mrs. Auerbach's indomitable spirit and the many pioneering steps she had taken over the years in the fields of retailing and human relations.

Some 800 persons filled Temple Beth Israel's sanctuary for the funeral service Sunday. Among the mourners were Governor and Mrs. Dempsey.

Born in Hartford on July 7, 1887, the daughter of Moses and Theresa Stern Fox, Mrs. Auerbach worked briefly as a salesgirl in the store for her grandfather, Gershon Fox, had founded and which she was eventually to head.

In 1911 she married George S. Auerbach, a Salt Lake City, Utah, department store official.

When a 1917 fire threatened to write finis to G. Fox & Co., the Auerbachs came east to help Moses Fox rebuild the store. George Auerbach went on to become treasurer and general manager of the store, positions assumed by Mrs. Auerbach upon her husband's death in 1927. She also became vice president of the store prior to ascending to the presidency following her father's death in 1938.

BROKE BIAS BARRIER

Under Mrs. Auerbach's leadership, G. Fox & Co. in 1942 became the first large department store in the country to hire Negroes in sales

and supervisory positions. She also pioneered the five-day store week.

Among the many honors accorded her was the B'nai B'rith Women's Annual Award in 1950 as the most outstanding woman in the community. In 1964 she was named a board member of the Hebrew Union College. The same year, she received the Human Relations Award in the Connecticut-Western Massachusetts Region of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

She was a member of Congregation Beth Israel, which her grandfather helped found.

In 1941, Mrs. Auerbach established the Beatrice Fox Auerbach Foundation which over the years has helped finance educations for many college students.

In 1945, she founded the Service Bureau for Women's Organizations, one of her many contributions to the field of education.

Two facilities at the University of Hartford—its school of business administration and its major lecture hall—bear the name of Beatrice Fox Auerbach. She also made a bequest to Connecticut College for Women to set up an Auerbach major in retailing and allied fields. Wesleyan University, Hillyer College and St. Joseph College presented her with honorary degrees.

A highly treasured award Mrs. Auerbach received was the Tobe Award, the "Oscar" of retailing, which she got in 1947.

In 1955, she was one of several Connecticut delegates to the White House Conference on Education.

Among the many beneficiaries of her efforts and funds were the Hartford Symphony and the Wadsworth Athenaeum.

A key move in the history of downtown Hartford was Mrs. Auerbach's decision a decade ago to launch an \$8 million east wing expansion of the store.

On Oct. 27, 1965, Fox's—which for years was the largest privately owned department store in the country—was sold to the May Co. for an estimated \$40 million. Mrs. Auerbach stayed on as head of the store. Last year, she announced the appointment of Richard Koopman as president and Bernard Schiro as chairman of the board of G. Fox & Co. Both men are sons-in-law of Mrs. Auerbach.

Since the change in ownership, the May Co. has announced plans to establish G. Fox branch stores in Waterbury and Meriden and has purchased land in Enfield for another store.

Mrs. Auerbach lived at 1040 Prospect Avenue and also owned the 230-acre Auerfarm in Bloomfield, founded by her husband in 1926.

She leaves two daughters, Mrs. Richard Koopman and Mrs. Bernard Schiro, both of West Hartford; 12 grandchildren, and one sister, Mrs. Leslie R. Samuels of New York.

At the above-mentioned service in Temple Beth Israel, Rabbi Harold S. Silver and Rabbi Emeritus Abraham J. Feldman officiated. (Excerpts from Dr. Feldman's eulogy appear elsewhere in this issue.)

Burial was in Beth Israel Cemetery. Weinstein Mortuary was in charge of arrangements.

RABBI FELDMAN DELIVERS EULOGY TO MRS. AUERBACH

HARTFORD.—Rabbi Abraham J. Feldman, rabbi emeritus of Temple Beth Israel, was Mrs. Beatrice Fox Auerbach's spiritual leader for many years. Following are excerpts from the eulogy he delivered at the funeral service for her Sunday at the temple in West Hartford:

"In one of the loveliest passages in the Bible an ancient sage paid tribute to a type of womanhood which, in different days and in a different social and economic context, brings us together here and now. Surely you recall those ageless words with which that sage began his tribute:

"A woman of valor who can find?" and proceeds then to a description of one who was

greatly esteemed in her family and in her community, a woman who was diligent, skillful, a superb administrator and at the same time taking care of her family, guiding, teaching and encouraging them whilst also doing her duty of love, of concern, of helpfulness to those beyond her family who are in need of help and love.

"Given such a woman, said that ancient author, one need speak no eulogies for her. His final words of tribute were 'Her works praise her in the gates,' that is, her deeds proclaim her valor, her character, her worth."

"That, my friends, is the type of woman we are gathered to pay tribute to, a tribute that is non-essential because what Beatrice Fox Auerbach was, what she did, what she contributed to life—these proclaim more effectively than any words which we may speak, any praise of her, any appreciation of her, any gratitude to her. 'Her works praise her in the gates.'"

"But really, I am not thinking of Beatrice Auerbach's business acumen and genius. I am not thinking only of her managerial skills. I am not even thinking of her philanthropies, great and blessed as they are."

"I am thinking of Beatrice whom I loved as a sister and cherished as a friend. I am thinking of the human being that she was and of her love of people—all people, the great and the not-so-great, the renowned and famous and the humble and unheralded. She loved people as human beings and more than the public acclaim, the tributes, the honors which came to her in abundance, she craved and rejoiced when she received the love of people, their confidence in her, their sharing with her their joys and sorrows, hopes and their dreams, their anxieties and their fears. And what she craved, she gave."

"I do not know how she was motivated in making her business decisions. But I do know that when matters affecting the community were discussed, her immediate concern was how these would affect people. Was it good for people? Will it make their lives easier and happier? Is it fair? Is it right? And we have all seen, to use but one example, the evidences of this motivation in her dealing with the people in 'The Store' and in her employment practices there."

"I think that her generosity in the gifts which she made to educational institutions, the buildings which she caused to be erected, the professorships which she endowed, the subsidies which she provided, the scholarships which she made available and many, many others, were prompted by her eagerness to enrich, to uplift the cultural values of people and especially the younger ones amongst us."

"But with all her wide interests and the many demands made upon her time and attention, Beatrice Fox Auerbach was also a mother and grandmother, and none was more proud, more loving and more concerned in these roles. She was also a devoted sister even as she had been an adoring and devoted daughter. She was a loving and proud wife and a superb and gracious homemaker."

"She was a considerate and loyal friend and a happy and loyal member of the Congregation Beth Israel which, by coincidence, is celebrating tonight its 125th Anniversary, in the founding of which her grandfather was a participant."

"And next to her love of people and family and friends was her love of the City of Hartford and the State of Connecticut. She was extraordinarily proud of the City and State of her birth, jealous for their good repute, and her wrath was quick if anyone in her presence dared to speak ill of them or in denigration of her City and State."

[From the Connecticut Jewish Ledger, Dec. 5, 1968]

BEATRICE FOX AUERBACH

The death of Mrs. Beatrice Fox Auerbach may be said to mark the end of an era both

in the life of the Jewish Community in Connecticut as well as in the larger community.

Born and reared in Connecticut, she was extraordinarily proud of and devoted to her City and State and from the time of the untimely death of her husband, George Auerbach, when she was yet a young woman, she entered into the family business. G. Fox & Co., founded by her grandfather, and under the tutelage of her late father, Moses Fox, she became one of the most skillful and progressive department storepeople in the country. She was a woman of vision, she possessed enormous energy and drive, and, whilst cherishing the past and having a very wholesome attitude towards that which was of the past, she had complete faith and confidence in the validity of the claims of the present and the promise of the future. And so she became a most skillful business woman.

But to think of Beatrice Auerbach in terms only of business is to misread the facts. She believed that the present has a debt both to the past and to the future; to the past—in that it was not to be permitted to become the cause of smugness; to the future—in that life must be constantly advancing and progressing. This sense of duty found expression in her concern for and with people qua people, and because of this deep conviction and sense of moral values, she set herself to the task of doing what she could to make life happier, more wholesome for those in the present and who are to follow us. And so she used the means with which she was blessed to do just that.

Her philanthropies were great. As a Jew she was one of the major contributors to the Hartford Jewish Federation. She was identified affirmatively with the Synagogue. She supported Jewish causes. She was especially interested in the field of higher education and so, when the University of Hartford came into being, she gave generously to the creation of buildings on that new campus. She endowed a Professorship at Trinity College. She provided scholarships for young women at the Connecticut College for Women. She subsidized the Symphony Orchestra of Hartford and the Opera Department of the Hartt School of Music, and many, many other educational institutions. She believed in the role which women must play on the basis of equality in the total social life, and so she created an agency that would help women to find a dignified and constructive role in society.

And with all this she did not permit these various absorbing activities to diminish in any way her role as mother and grandmother, as kinswoman and friend. She was a gracious homemaker and a gracious and considerate friend.

But above everything else she was interested in and loved people. Her attitude toward the employees in "The Store" was that of an elder sister. She was interested in the personal life, the anxieties and the happiness which the people, who worked in the store, had. She sought to enter into their lives and strove to be helpful where she could and to share where she might. In a very real sense it might be said of her in the words of Holy Writ, she was "a Woman of Valor" and as she closed her eyes in death, it is literally true that "her works praise her in the gates". She made the community richer for her being part of it, better because she was in it, and her name and memory are blessed and cherished and, through that which she has created, will continue to be blessed in the years and decades ahead.

HARTFORD FEDERATION PRESIDENT EXTOLLS MRS. AUERBACH

HARTFORD.—Charles Rubenstein, president of the Hartford Jewish Federation, commenting to the Ledger this week on the passing of Mrs. Beatrice Fox Auerbach, declared:

"The death of Mrs. Beatrice Fox Auerbach is a great loss to the Hartford area and especially its Jewish community. Mrs. Auerbach gave understanding and inspired leadership in many philanthropic endeavors. She especially remembered her Jewish well-springs and participated fully in our religious and social welfare undertakings."

"Mrs. Auerbach gave of her sustenance, counsel and efforts on behalf of the Hartford Jewish Federation and its many beneficiaries since their beginnings. Her home was opened to us during the campaign period and her support was always in evidence."

"Mrs. Auerbach was recognized for her leadership by being elected an honorary vice president of the Federation, and served in 1966 as the honorary chairman of this community's first Ambassador's Ball. She was truly an 'Ayshes Chayil.'"

[From the Hartford Courant, Dec. 1, 1968]

MRS. BEATRICE FOX AUERBACH

The death of Mrs. Beatrice Fox Auerbach takes from the community one of its distinguished benefactors and notable personalities. It is not alone that Mrs. Auerbach, as head of G. Fox & Company, was a leader in the American merchandising world. But in addition, she had a remarkable breadth of interests and sympathies which drew her generous support both here and far and wide, and which made her a vital personality.

The big department store that had originally been founded in two small dry-goods rooms by her grandfather Gershon Fox more than 120 years ago, and subsequently developed by her father Moses Fox, came under Mrs. Auerbach's jurisdiction in 1938. She was amply prepared for the task, of course, having been treasurer since the death of her husband, George S. Auerbach, in 1927. But the genius that developed G. Fox & Company into the largest family-owned store in the country, and the biggest in volume in New England outside of Boston, was chiefly her own. Department stores around the nation gave attention to merchandising methods and policies inaugurated at G. Fox under her direction, and numerous ideas tried out there subsequently became widely employed. When in 1965 G. Fox & Company joined with the May Department Stores of St. Louis, Missouri, in a stock transaction valued at more than \$41 million, Mrs. Auerbach and her family continued to conduct the business of the store within the May management. Until fairly recently, when illness hampered her activity, the diminutive, lively Mrs. Auerbach could be seen daily about the big store.

One might think that running so large a business would have required all Mrs. Auerbach's time and attention. But this would be to underrate her boundless energies and capacities for seeing life whole. Many causes in the community, many aspects of life in general, knew her support and the impact of her personality. Other columns of The Courant report them in detail. But one must remark here again especially the aid to education that distinguished her. In its near-three decades, the Beatrice Fox Auerbach Foundation has given liberally to Trinity and other colleges in Connecticut. It helped finance educations for many college students. The fact that Mrs. Auerbach had received honors from many institutions, including the Universities of Connecticut and Hartford, Hartford College for Women, Hebrew Union College in Cincinnati and Wesleyan University, and from other institutions like St. Francis Hospital, testifies not only to her continuing regard for community weal, but the regard which in turn this community and others felt toward her.

Yet this was not yet the whole scope of Mrs. Auerbach's interests. She had an acute interest in the arts, and particularly music which she had come to know early in childhood. Hence her close activity with the Symphony Society of Greater Hartford. Her in-

terest in youngsters was well served by her many years on the advisory committee of the Girl Scouts of Hartford. And beyond this she looked at the wider world with keenest interest. She traveled widely, belonged to organizations of world scope, and in the realm of careers for women it was only natural she should be a leader.

Thus, Mrs. Beatrice Fox Auerbach leaves the community richer for her having been here, poorer because she is now gone. And her personal friends will be especially grieved. She was a wise, amusing and gracious companion and friend. The world was never too big nor too busy for a greeting or a chat. Many persons in many stations and walks of life must now be saddened.

[From the Hartford Times, Dec. 1, 1968]

BEATRICE FOX AUERBACH

A stranger in Hartford who visited G. Fox & Co.'s store in the years when Mrs. Beatrice Fox Auerbach was its active head might have mistaken her for an assistant department manager.

She often worked side by side with a buyer, checking stock and examining the merchandise, a pencil thrust into her hair and her hands dusty.

But that was only one of the ways in which she kept communications open with her staff and with the public. She was one of the most capable merchants in the United States. She maintained a great department store business on a foundation of service and integrity.

Her appreciation of the responsibilities of wealth reflected those characteristics, too. Service and integrity were the marks of her many benefactions. She sought ways in which she could make the world better.

One woman, even one like Mrs. Auerbach, could not much improve the world unless she had the ability to look beyond the horizons of time and space.

The Service Bureau for Women's Organizations, which she sponsored, is one example of the way she looked at her opportunities. It is impossible to measure how much the Service Bureau has already changed society.

Many a woman has been enabled to realize her potential as a leader because of the Bureau's conferences and training programs, and many an active organization owes its vitality to those leaders. The influence will long outlive its originator.

In her benefactions, Mrs. Auerbach preferred to support activities that would have a continuing life. Scholarships, for instance, once endowed, produce results long after those who establish them are gone.

She tended to favor Connecticut, too. Much of what she gave went to people and organizations in her native state, which she loved fervently and loyally.

When she traveled, as she did often and widely, Mrs. Auerbach was received like an incognito princess. The doors of officials opened readily to her. But she preferred to talk with the women, learning how they lived, how they sought liberty and a chance to express themselves, how they fulfilled their womanhood.

We shall not soon understand how much Mrs. Auerbach meant to our state and our society, for the things she established will be operating for a long time to come. Eventually, posterity will measure her accomplishments more accurately than we can, and the scale will be grand.

[An editorial from WNHCTV 8, New Haven, Conn., Dec. 3, 1968]

CITIZENS HONOR MEMORY OF A GREAT HUMANITARIAN, MRS. BEATRICE FOX AUERBACH

A Mayor. A Congressman. A Governor. Community leaders. . . ordinary citizens. Yesterday, they were on hand by the hundreds to pay final tribute to a woman who left a lasting mark on the city of Hartford, the State, and the nation.

Mrs. Beatrice Fox Auerbach—born in Hartford in 1887—helped build a great commercial enterprise. One which was long ago a leader in equal-opportunity employment and promotion.

Mrs. Auerbach's vitality, of course, touched many areas of human concern. Her goals will go on through the Foundation which bears her name . . . and which has helped so many gain an education. The Service Bureau for Women's Organization is another of the efforts she created—and which make a constant impact on the progress of the state.

Most fitting were the words of Rabbi Abraham Feldman at yesterday's service: "If she could say some parting words . . . this day, she would say 'these ears cannot hear your eulogies; so, honor them with your deeds for my fellow men'."

There, in perfect expression, were the ideals of Mrs. Beatrice Fox Auerbach. We join so many in honoring the memory of a humanitarian.

A REALISTIC ASSESSMENT OF CHINA

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the New York Times Magazine contained an excellent article about the need for the United States to reassess its policy toward China. Author of the article is Allen S. Whiting, an authority on Chinese foreign policy, until recently a State Department official in Hong Kong, and now an international relations professor at the University of Michigan.

Mr. Whiting's realistic approach deserves the careful examination of every Member of Congress. His article follows:

TIME FOR A CHANGE IN OUR CHINA POLICY

Like Liza Doolittle, students of our China policy will be tempted to greet President Richard Nixon with the frustrated cry, "Words, words, words. Speak me no words, show me!" For if anything characterizes Washington's attitude toward Peking in the last eight years it is the change in words without a change in policy. This was vividly shown by the alacrity with which Vice President Humphrey elevated to national attention Prof. A. Doak Barnett's phrase from the 1966 Fulbright hearings, "containment without isolation," as foreshadowing a new approach. Small matter that each audience defined differently what was to be "contained." Scholars at the hearing argued whether the "containment" was to be political and cultural or military and whether it was to include covert subversion as well as overt aggression. Secretary of State Dean Rusk, on the other hand, foresaw 800 million Chinese, "armed with nuclear weapons," who would have to be contained by 1980. Nor was it clear precisely whose isolation was to be ended. Would it be that of the United States, which had taken a lonely road, away from the international business world, by its total embargo on trade with China?

These questions became particularly urgent for the incoming Administration on Nov. 26, when the Chinese Foreign Ministry formally called for a Sino-American agreement on "peaceful coexistence." Until now, Washington phrasemakers have been preoccupied with form, not content. They have insisted that while we change our "posture" it is Peking which must change its behavior. Hence our peace-keeping sermons tell China to "leave its neighbors alone," and we hope

that "China can once again join the international community when its belligerence ends." Self-righteous pleas for Peking to end nuclear tests accompany pious pledges to "build bridges" and "work toward a dialogue." Meanwhile we manufacture nuclear nightmares by justifying an antiballistic-missile defense system in terms of "the Chinese ICBM threat" and educate Asian leaders from Japan to Thailand in the hazards of future "nuclear blackmail" by Peking.

It is time for a change. In fact, it has been time for many years. The late Julius C. Holmes, then Consul General in Hong Kong, sent specific suggestions for a change to the Department of State in December, 1960, on the eve of a new Administration. Holmes's letter could, with only minor alterations, be submitted by the present Consul General without embarrassment, so little have things changed.

With another new Administration beginning in Washington and an old one crumbling in Peking, the temptation will be strong for the Department of State to caution that change must await "the right moment." This argument can be bolstered by pointing to the uncertainties of a Vietnam settlement, which might coincide with the death of Mao Tse-tung, and the aftermath of Mao's disastrous Cultural Revolution.

Attractive and protective for the bureaucracy as this waiting game is, it perpetuates negative practices adopted in reaction to the North Korean aggression of 1950, the defeat suffered by Gen. Douglas MacArthur's forces after they provoked massive Chinese intervention in Korea, and the fateful fantasies of Senator Joseph McCarthy, who concocted a Communist conspiracy in the Department of State that "lost" China to Mao Tse-tung. Times have obviously changed, but the basic policy has not.

The policy is based on the assumption that "the right moment" will be perceived in time. Unfortunately, that moment is all too often seen only in retrospect. One "right moment" came in the mid-fifties, when President Eisenhower, responding to a press query, listed several steps Peking would have to take to win a reconsideration of Washington's position both in bilateral relations and in the United Nations. Quietly but consistently, the People's Republic of China reacted, releasing Americans from jail, withdrawing its forces from North Korea and receiving the United Nations Secretary General in Peking. The only response from Washington was a harsh restatement of our cold-war view of the mainland regime by Secretary of State John Foster Dulles in San Francisco in June, 1957.

Another flaw in the "right moment" approach is that it places primary emphasis on the actions and reactions of Peking, which should be only one factor in the formation of our policy. In addition, we must consider the reactions of other governments and test our own reactions by juxtaposing values and principles against the literal definition and implementation of policy. To the extent that we deceive ourselves, we will suffer a loss of respect and confidence both at home and abroad.

The events of 1962 provide a dramatic study in the "perception gap" between Washington and Peking, which brought a moment of tension in the Taiwan Strait and a short war in the high Himalayas.

In early June of that year, reliable sources on Taiwan reported a sudden and massive movement of Chinese troops into the nearby provinces of Fukien and Chekiang, bringing Communist troop concentrations opposite Quemoy and Matsu to their highest levels since 1950. Tense White House meetings in which the mysterious movement was debated produced an even split between those who feared that it foreshadowed an attack and those who thought that it was an inexplicable defensive measure.

Suddenly the Chinese Embassy in Warsaw requested an urgent meeting, the first such

substantive contact since the Quemoy crisis of 1958. Ambassador Wang Ping-nan astonished his normally imperturbable counterpart, Ambassador John Moors Cabot, by warning the United States not to permit Chiang Kai-shek to invade the mainland. From Washington's perspective, nothing could have been more far-fetched than to fear American intentions toward the mainland at that time. President Kennedy had given specific hints about the probable availability of wheat should China request aid in overcoming the shortages that followed natural calamities and the collapse of the Great Leap Forward. More generally, the Bay of Pigs had shown Kennedy's refusal to risk overt involvement in a relatively small and nearby operation. Chiang Kai-shek's forces had little capability for moving men and equipment to the mainland and no bombers or offensive missiles. Chiang was wholly dependent on U.S. firepower and transport.

Ridden with fears of foreign exploitation of their internal weaknesses, however, Peking officials were described by an acute diplomatic observer as "panicky." Incredible as this seemed of Long March veterans with decades of triumph over adversity, it proved an accurate description. They anxiously watched an increase in the frequency of official American visits and the stature of the visitors to Taiwan in early 1962. They found significance in Chiang Kai-shek's strengthened pledges to liberate the mainland, his newly enacted "war tax" and accelerated "planning" by special military groups. Peking apparently concluded that the Kennedy Administration would try to recoup its Bay of Pigs setback in the Taiwan Strait. Its response was a Chinese form of deterrence: the moving of divisions and execution of a diplomatic *démarche*. President Kennedy responded by publicly opposing the use of force by either side in the Taiwan Strait. From Peking's point of view, it had succeeded in its deterrent effort.

Unknown to Washington at the time were other factors that shaped the Chinese outlook. The internal situation was much worse than the West suspected. Martial law held entire provinces secure against peasant raids on granaries. Malnutrition lowered birth rates and raised death rates to produce a sharp decline in population growth. Peking's concern that its true state might be detected was heightened in May, 1962, when several hundred thousand Chinese poured across the Hong Kong border seeking economic relief and resettlement. Similarly, at the opposite end of China, tens of thousands of Uigurs and Kirghiz sought refuge among ethnically similar groups in the Soviet Union, fleeing religious, political and economic pressures in Sinkiang.

Just as Peking misunderstood developments on Taiwan, so, too, it misinterpreted unrest in Sinkiang as a Russian effort to subvert an area long coveted and in past times separated from Chinese control. Again Peking moved troops to seal off a threatened border. Moreover, it closed the Soviet consulate in Urumchi and expelled the handful of so-called White Russians who had been there since the Russian Revolution. During their subsequent exodus through Hong Kong, they provided graphic accounts of the extreme measures taken by Chinese military authorities to snuff out any possible uprising.

Little objective evidence supported Peking's suspicion that Premier Nikita Khrushchev was playing Stalin's subversive game in China's borderlands. However, it is not reality but the way men perceive it that conditions policy. The most egregious example of this phenomenon, coinciding with the Sinkiang and Taiwan crises, concerned Sino-Indian relations. After years of diplomatic representations and military passivity in the face of Chinese road construction through the disputed Ladakh plateau, on the western end of the Himalayas, Indian patrols began to

move behind Chinese outposts in the spring of 1962. New Delhi could not have picked a worse moment. Peking concluded that only incitement by Moscow or Washington, or both, could explain this sudden initiative, obviously timed to take advantage of internal weaknesses, Tibetan restiveness and external pressures on China's eastern and western borders. The summer saw Chinese suspicions grow; minor incidents triggered an open warning against further Indian advances in Ladakh lest China activate its claims to "the eastern end of the frontier." This thinly veiled threat against India's Northeast Frontier Agency gave Nehru pause, but political pressures forced a continuation of military activity. A final ultimatum from Peking in September was shrugged off by New Delhi with virulent oaths "to recover every inch of sacred Indian soil." The results were nearly disastrous for Indian prestige, not to mention the Indian Army, in the short Sino-Indian war six weeks later.

A study of the events of 1962, in addition to illustrating the folly of counting on reciprocity at "the right moment" for policy change, helps place in perspective the record of Chinese aggression. Peking's use of military force was prompted by more than the simple desire to have its own way in a border dispute. Just as the anticipation of an invasion from Taiwan brought troop deployments and a warning to Washington and the fear of separatist revolts in Sinkiang evoked a similar move against Moscow, so Peking acted to halt Indian probes before they awakened sympathetic responses in Tibet. This does not justify China's sudden attacks against Indian troops. It does, however, place them in a more specific framework; it shows them to be more than the crude stereotype of massive Chinese power lashing out at will against vulnerable neighbors.

In fact, China's two great ventures outside its borders have suggestive similarities. Its intervention in the Korean War came at a time of extreme domestic instability and vulnerability. President Truman's dispatch of the Seventh Fleet to the Taiwan Strait denied Peking access to the defeated Chinese Nationalists and implied a willingness to preserve them as a Western counterforce against the Chinese Communists. General MacArthur's to the Yalu despite explicit advance warnings against such a drive only confirmed Peking's fears that passivity under these circumstances would invite more trouble later. Similarly, Indian actions and reactions in 1962, when China was in internal disarray and sensed external threats, contributed to the decision that immediate offensive action was safer than defensive action later.

Today, China is again in the throes of internal difficulties, and in the near future Mao will pass from the scene. The present and prospective instability makes it likely that any move on China's periphery susceptible to hostile interpretation will be so interpreted. Conversely, "signals" of good intent will evoke no positive response; they will be treated as efforts to deceive or entrap Chinese leaders.

Obviously, the alleviation of Chinese fears is hardly a sufficient guide for policy. However, where such fears may be unnecessarily heightened, it would seem wise to weigh words and actions most carefully. And a recognition of the relationship between Chinese anxieties in foreign affairs and internal difficulties may reduce expectations of reciprocal warmth and friendship. In today's idiom, if Peking is uptight, we should keep our cool.

We have already oversold Asians on the prospective perils of a people's war backed by 800 million Chinese possessing nuclear weapons. Anxious Thais look to us for guarantees against "nuclear blackmail" after the Vietnam war, while officials in Kuala Lumpur, Singapore and Canberra confer on how to fill the void to be created by British withdrawal in 1970.

How serious is the threat of guerrilla war in Southeast Asia, aided and abetted by Peking? A close look at the insurgencies of Thailand, Burma and India, all within easy reach of Chinese power, discloses an amazingly small effort by Peking; either the Chinese have not really cared much or they have not been too effective. In any event, the results are most unimpressive.

Not until Thailand began serving openly as a base for U.S. air attacks against targets in Laos and North Vietnam did Chinese-backed insurgents pose any active threat to isolated areas in the north and northeast. Numbering between 1,000 and 2,000, with a motley collection of weapons purchased largely in the black markets of Laos and Thailand, they have had little staying power. Nor have they grown through reinforcements from Chinese training camps in the last three years. However, some Thai officials, alert to the military and economic benefits of a Communist threat, have adapted to the times. Special organizations in Bangkok study the insurrection problem. In the afflicted provinces an array of techniques for combating insurgency and tying remote wilderness to central control blossoms under American guidance. Vested interests, both Thai and American, have found the exaggeration of the Chinese threat useful.

Thoughtful Thais, on the other hand, worry increasingly over the visible erosion of values and independence which accompanies the large American presence, an explosive mixture of nationalistic sensitivity and xenophobic suspicion has fueled occasional anti-American outbursts by Government officials and the semiofficial press. The crosscurrents of Thai attitudes, both real and assumed, make the reduction of our presence there a "damned if you do, damned if you don't" proposition. On balance, however, a candid assessment of the situation should reassure Thai leaders that any present or prospective Chinese threat is easily within their capacity to handle. Ultimately, of course, the Southeast Asian Treaty remains as a guarantee of U.S. support in case of overt attack.

Burma, sharing a border with China and plagued with insurgency since its rebirth in 1948, would seem to have been doomed to a national liberation struggle. Yet Rangoon's leaders have refused to panic or kowtow to Peking. On the contrary, U Nu gave Chinese leaders a unique lecture on how big nations should treat small ones during a state visit in the mid-fifties. Last summer Ne Win's police permitted the Rangoon populace to wage a bloody pogrom against Chinese diplomats and merchants, using Cultural Revolution propaganda excesses as an excuse. Recent press reports say joint Burmese-Indian consultations have concerned common insurgency problems along the frontier with China. If this is true, it further indicates the quiet but determined manner with which Gen Ne Win shows his independence of pressure from Peking.

True, China does not leave its neighbors alone. Peking's patronage keeps alive the minuscule, militant Communist party of Burma, the so-called "White Flags," whose more moderate rivals have long been out of favor with Peking. Recent "White Flag" internecine struggles, paralleling those in China, have reduced still further their negligible power. Similarly, Peking periodically fishes in the troubled waters of Shan, Kachin and Karen insurgency with only slightly greater success. And the Ne Win Government is intermittently attacked by the Peking radio as a "facist" regime certain to be overthrown by "armed struggle."

But the question is not whether we have evidence of Chinese subversion in Burma. Rather we should ask: How serious is the threat? The record to date shows that Rangoon, with little aid or advice from Washington, finds it worrisome but tolerable.

Perhaps the clearest case of limited Chinese interest and capability is India. After the 1962 Sino-Indian war this divided and weak country seemed certain to be the target of Chinese probes through the anti-Indian people of the sub-Himalayan plateau and the dissident tribes of the eastern hills bordering Burma and China. Chinese broadcasts, training and arms do feed unrest in these areas. But the most notable result, the Naga insurrection, hardly merits the grandiloquent tributes paid it by Peking Review. A straggly, divided congeries of poorly equipped guerrillas, numbering about 1,000, continue to roam the hills and raid Indian Army outposts, but have little impact beyond their traditional home base. More important, an inventory of Chinese material support suggests little investment of resources by Peking in the Naga effort.

It might be argued that such restraint as Peking may exercise is not voluntary but rather the result of fear that too overt or large an effort will trigger American counteraction. The differing degrees of U.S. commitment in Thailand, Burma and India, however, do not seem to be inversely proportionate to the Chinese involvement in local insurgency. On the contrary, the most concrete and consistent evidence of Peking's support for local insurrection is in Thailand, where Communist China would seem to have the greatest cause for concern over our reaction.

In sum, whether as American allies, weak neutrals or disputants of Chinese claims, countries vulnerable to Peking's power have survived 19 years of Mao's rule with relatively little damage. Indeed, one might ask whether these pockets of insurgency in remote mountain and jungle areas are not to be expected in such countries. So long as resistance to authority remains below the level at which it might affect other parts of the country or society, it may even be better to handle it marginally rather than risk the material and political costs of elevating it in importance, giving it international significance.

But what of the future? Does not the triumph of Mao over Liu Shao-chi and the eventual succession of Lin Biao increase the support Peking is likely to give these insurgencies? Worse, will not the acquisition of nuclear weapons make Peking willing to take greater risks in backing so-called "people's wars"?

Not for 20 years has the political scene seemed so confused as in the aftermath of Mao's Cultural Revolution. However, certain outlines are emerging: In contrast to all of Peking's pronouncements, Mao failed in his twin objectives of smashing the Establishment and substituting for it hand-picked followers willing to carry out the utopian experiments that failed so disastrously in the Great Leap Forward. Power lies not in Peking but in the provinces, where local military commanders exercise authority through so-called "Revolutionary Committees" embodying precisely those elements most opposed to the absurdities of the Cultural Revolution. Throughout South China, in particular, the defeat of Mao's favorite Red Guards was so brutal and bloody as to make student demonstrations elsewhere in the world look like Sunday school picnics.

The inevitable struggle that will follow Mao's death is unlikely to find his chosen successor, Lin Biao, retaining more than symbolic power, and that may be short-lived. Of slight physical stamina, with limited political appeal and no national base in the army, party or Government, Lin can be little more than a front man for an independent-minded coalition. Chou En-lai, far stronger on all counts, is a more likely winner, but he is nearing 70 and shows the effects of the incredible strain of managing the Cultural Revolution so as to please Mao on the one hand and preserve the regime on the other.

The more fundamental question, however, is not *who* but *what* will survive Mao. The

credibility of his theories has suffered so much as to raise doubts about the doctrine that will emerge after his death. We can expect less commitment to "national liberation struggles" from military commanders responsible for maintaining order at home. Their time and energy will be devoted primarily to internal affairs, although external threats will receive vigilant attention. Local insurgents will be seen as little more than another counter to threats posed by foreign bases and hostile operations on China's periphery.

As for conventional or nuclear threats, the probabilities are no more worrisome. China's military elite has a keen appreciation of costs and vulnerabilities. Its experience in the bloody Korean stalemate was sufficiently sobering to prompt extreme caution in the subsequent 15 years. Except for a few weeks of carefully limited attacks in the 1958 Quemoy crisis and in the 1962 Sino-Indian conflict, China's forces have by and large, remained behind their frontiers. They offered minor diversionary pressure on the Himalayan frontier during the 1965 Pak-Indian war. They also rendered valuable covert assistance to North Vietnam in the form of construction, railroad engineering and antiaircraft divisions, numbering perhaps 50,000 troops. But a military ascendancy in Peking should prove no more dangerous as a major source of aggression than has that of a civilian leadership under Mao.

Nor will the acquisition of nuclear weapons transform this elite, now in its late fifties, into reckless risk-takers. Indeed, it is difficult to write a credible scenario for Chinese nuclear blackmail or nuclear confrontation at Chinese initiative. Ethnocentrism combines with a superiority complex to make Chinese tutelage difficult for would-be revolutionaries, whether Asian or African, as evidenced by disappointed defectors from Peking's camp. In addition, China's confidence in the long trend of history makes it believe that an eventual U.S. withdrawal from Asia is inevitable. These elements limit Peking's willingness to sacrifice or take risks on behalf of objectives outside its immediate security interests. The horrendous consequences of nuclear war should heighten still further this pattern of caution and limited involvement.

American officials and scholars, granting this general situation, have anxiously wondered why China wants nuclear weapons. The question might be better put: Why not? Chinese leaders clearly have opted for the symbols of power, regardless of their utility. If the ghetto black finds in the gun an answer to a lifetime of admonitions to "move along," so Chinese Communist officials gain psychic, if not actual, satisfaction in the bomb after two decades of stern warnings to "stay put."

Some observers raise the "madman" theory to justify the focusing of Asian and American fears on China's nuclear future. The theory is conventionally put this way: "We must prepare against the enemy's capabilities, not his intentions." But the material and emotional costs of planning against the possibility of a truly irrational use of nuclear weapons can only lead to political and economic bankruptcy for ourselves and those we convince of this need. We must instead refine our calculations to make them consonant with a reasonable range of likely actions by those we consider in conflict with our interests.

There is no question that the interests of Washington and Peking conflict. The final disposition of Taiwan and the Chiang Kai-shek Government is the linchpin of the conflict. The United States and China have been in such disharmony for so long that it is fatuous in the extreme to expect any easy or sudden change in relations in the foreseeable future. But improvement is possible. The conduct of both sides in the Vietnam war showed considerable progress, to say the

least, over their Korean war behavior. Similarly, except for statements by Secretary Rusk and occasional remarks by others, the speeches of Assistant Secretaries for the Far East Roger Hillsman and William P. Bundy, as well as those of Under Secretary of State Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, did much to soften the harsh image of Peking formed during the Dulles years.

We can do more than mute the polemics, however. We can move to positive acts which serve our own interests and permit the Chinese to change their perceptions of us as time and experience permit. No more immediate step in this direction can be taken than to lift our embargo on trade with Communist China, excepting strategic goods presently embargoed for all Communist countries. This will not reverse our gold flow or enrich American exporters overnight. It may lead to little actual trade, at least until China recovers from its present economic depression. It will, however, place us on a competitive basis with the many Asian and European countries who sell China everything from wheat to giant chemical complexes, regardless of their diplomatic ties with the mainland or Taiwan.

Ending the trade embargo would also allow us to end our meddling interference in third countries, demanding proof that our imports are free of Chinese Communist materials and our exports are not ultimately bound for Chinese Communist use. No less important for the morale of American travelers and officials overseas would be the end of the penny-ante policing of our tourists to prevent them from buying Chinese products. The rage and ridicule such practices arouse are part of the cost of pursuing policies adopted during our retreat from the Yalu. Even a \$2 steamer ride from Hong Kong to nearby Macao is taboo because the U.S. Treasury suspects that the line's owners have contributed to Chinese Communist coffers.

Finally, permitting normal trade would give proof of our sincere desire to see China develop peacefully so long as it does not war with us or our allies. Another step toward this end would be the absolute exclusion of U.S. military aircraft and naval vessels from an area of reasonable size off the Chinese coast. Whether our missions in such areas are accidental or designed to acquire military information, they would seem best avoided because they reinforce Peking's belief in our hostility and arrogance.

More far-reaching, of course, will be what we do as well as what we say in ending the Vietnam war. If negotiations are expanded to include parties other than those presently agreed to at Paris, we should strive for participation by Peking. Exclusion will increase Chinese suspicion. Moreover, while China is not directly involved in South Vietnam, its presence in the northern Laotian province of Phongsaly has remained fairly constant since the 1962 Geneva accords. Thus it would be practical as well as politic to win Chinese participation in any comprehensive settlement embracing Laos as well as South Vietnam.

Were we to succeed in these steps, the far more complex matters of recognition and United Nations membership could be examined at greater length. Those who oppose any change of policy unless there is a guaranteed response from Peking sometimes argue that "it takes two to tango." While the foregoing steps can have positive effects whether or not Peking responds, this admonition does apply to the exchange of diplomatic recognition. A dramatic unilateral announcement recognizing the People's Republic of China as *de jure* sovereign over the mainland might cause confusion in Peking, but that would be nothing compared to the uproar it would produce in Taipei, Tokyo and elsewhere. Yet it almost certainly would not increase contact beyond the present Warsaw talks.

However, the secret and systematic exploration of Chinese views might be solicited, perhaps during or after a Vietnam confer-

ence. There may be some halfway point between our present relationship and the exchange of ambassadors to which we can move until agreement is reached on the status of Taiwan. Britain and China have had mutual diplomatic missions headed by charges d'affaires since 1950. British citizens and property were handled brutally during the Cultural Revolution, but British interests in China, particularly Hong Kong, were served by the opportunity to meet formally, promptly and in absolute secrecy as frequently as both sides desired. Obviously Warsaw is a poor substitute for Peking.

To the extent that we are consistent and convincing in our acceptance of the People's Republic of China as *China*, a legitimate member of the international community, we can expect Peking to participate more positively in that community. It is not surprising that isolated invitations to confer on one matter or another, often with the inclusion of Chinese Nationalists already arranged, are rejected out of hand so long as the inner circle, the Security Council, awards permanent membership to Taiwan's representative, thereby substituting 13 million people for a nation of 750 million. Our legal ledger may win votes in New York, but it does not lessen hostility in Peking.

Though the Chinese have said relatively little about the advent of the Nixon Administration, they have, through their call for a new agreement, left open the door to progress. The "five principles of coexistence," on which the new pact would be based, were first set out in a Sino-Indian agreement in April, 1954. They are: mutual respect for territorial integrity and sovereignty, nonaggression, noninterference in internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit and peaceful coexistence.

Of course, Peking's proposal was tied to its standard demand that the United States withdraw all its military forces from Taiwan and the Taiwan Strait. But there was a hint of hope in the initial dispatch from Hsinhua, the official press agency, on Nixon's electoral victory. Of all the Republican candidates' campaign statements, Hsinhua singled out for attention a pledge to "reduce our commitments around the world in areas where we are overextended" and "put more emphasis on the priority area." Though Peking may have been mistaken in its assumption that Nixon's "priority area" does not include the Asian mainland, its statements since his election have been notable for their lack of vitriol, and that leaves the new President with some relatively happy options.

Naturally, we cannot expect China to vote our way once it does participate in international affairs on a more regular basis. We can, however, be confident of the intermittent reconciliation of conflicting interests through traditional Asian bargaining and Western diplomacy. Nor must we assume that all our interests conflict. In such practical fields as population control, agricultural research and preventive medicine, our interests in Asian progress mesh with those of China. On the diplomatic front, our hope for more flexible Asian relationships can coincide with Chinese desires to avoid so exclusive a dependence on another state as existed before the Sino-Soviet dispute. But for future Chinese leaders to reject a possible rapprochement with Moscow they must have alternative sources of the trade and aid necessary for modernization. The reexamination of these matters in Peking must await the death of Mao, but we need not wait for that moment to consider the alternatives we may wish to pose for Peking.

Vietnam understandably is the first order of business in Asia for President Nixon and his new Secretary of State. In handling Vietnam, they will inevitably consider the larger frame of Southeast Asia, and in turn, mainland China. Reversing this order and reexamining our assumptions and policies toward China might provide different solu-

tions, more in accord with our global commitments and capabilities as well as with the situation on China's periphery. Regardless of which approach we take, the responsibility and opportunity are clearly ours for defining our relationship with China now and in the post-Mao year.

RECONFIRMATION EVERY 10 YEARS AND MANDATORY RETIREMENT AT AGE 70 URGED FOR SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1969

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a proposed amendment to the Constitution requiring that Justices of the Supreme Court be reconfirmed by the Senate every 10 years and establishing a mandatory retirement of Justices at the age of 70.

I first introduced this resolution on September 10, 1968, and since that time have received many communications, not only from my district and the State of Virginia but from all parts of the Nation in support of this proposal. Many people are profoundly concerned about this problem and feel that unless some corrective measures are taken, our whole governmental system may well be endangered.

I am convinced that no problem in America is more evident to the general public today than the need for some restrictions on the present power of the Supreme Court. The Court has gone far afield in the past two decades—usurping legislative powers and attempting to remold our society according to the philosophy of a majority of its members.

The Constitution never intended that this would be the function of the Supreme Court, and unless something is done soon to curb these activities, our whole society is going to be irreparably altered.

The wave of decisions by the Court in the past decade has greatly weakened the power of law-enforcement authorities and increased the problem of crime throughout the United States. The Court has exalted the standing of minority pressure groups to such an extent that the rights of the vast majority of Americans have been jeopardized. To a large extent, the Court's decisions have been legislative functions which the Constitution clearly designated to the Congress. There has been a persistent and consistent effort by a majority of the Court to force upon the public its own political, economic, and sociological views. In many respects, these decisions of the Court have transcended the acts of Congress and changed the fundamental philosophy of the separation of powers which is a basic foundation of our system of government.

It is pertinent that in 22 years, between 1937 and 1959, only six Federal laws were held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court.

But in the past 5 years more than twice that number have been declared

unconstitutional. Judicial restraint has been abandoned and judicial activism has taken its place. The Court has arrogated unto itself authority which it was not given by the Constitution and has set itself up as a judicial oligarchy.

We are all familiar with the controversial positions taken by the majority of Supreme Court members in recent years, such as outlawing prayers in public schools, banning segregation, the "one-man, one-vote" policy and other far-reaching pronouncements. Such decisions have imposed upon the Nation new rules of conduct and more importantly many of these so-called rules and unwritten laws have been imposed without congressional support.

Through its extension and interpretation of the Constitution the Supreme Court has revamped many areas of our national life and has created by virtue of its decisions a society which is much different than many of us have known before. The function of the Supreme Court is to interpret the law and to adjudicate lawsuits: It is not to write legislation or to mold and remake our society. The Founding Fathers did not intend that the Court should be a promoter of the public welfare nor an arbiter of the lives of American citizens.

Although the decisions of the Court in recent years have touched all Americans in many ways, no activity of the Court has been more shattering of the American status quo than its effect on crime in America. No greater challenge or danger faces this Nation than the Government's attitude toward crime. We have always had a criminal element but heretofore the function of the Government has been to curb the activities of criminals and to protect the law-abiding citizen. No longer is this true. The Federal Bureau of Investigation reports that there were increases in all categories of major crimes during the past year. While many of these categories relate to crime against individuals, by far the greatest increase was in crimes against society as a whole. Riotous conditions have existed in many of our large cities and much of this problem can be directly traced to decisions of the Supreme Court.

The public is understandably apprehensive and fearful as to what the future will bring when it looks to Washington and sees supposedly responsible public officials acting in an irresponsible manner. Certainly it is irresponsible when those who are elected or appointed to protect the public interest refuse to do that which protects the public as a whole, but rather succumb to the idea that criminals need to be pampered and protected.

Certainly no one would want to deny rights to any American citizen, but there comes a time when an individual's rights cannot be allowed to thwart society as a whole and this is a lesson which the majority of the Supreme Court apparently is unwilling to recognize.

Never in the history of America—even in the frontier days—has there been such widespread public concern and fear as there is today with reference to lawlessness throughout our land. Our law-enforcement officials to a large extent have been forced to govern their law-enforcing

activities by giving first consideration to how the Federal courts are likely to view their every action. Criminal elements, dissenters, beatniks, and others have tramped on our public institutions and flouted the laws governing the American society.

This deplorable situation has gone far enough. We cannot continue to tolerate conditions under which the lawless element and those who would undermine our society are given the upperhand in the control of that society. The Court continues to blindly contend that it is protecting the rights of the individual who commits a crime but overlooks the rights of the law-abiding citizens against whom the crimes may have been perpetrated.

We cannot hide the fact that many of the major crimes in the United States are today made more enticing to the criminal element simply because they feel they have a better chance of beating the law than heretofore has been the case. We must throw off the shackles which today impede law enforcement throughout the land and return the confidence of the general public that laws will be enforced.

The only way that I know to curb such usurpation of power is to place some restriction on the office of Supreme Court Justice itself. Supreme Court Justices—unlike Members of Congress who are elected by the people and responsive to the people—are in effect, the final voice in what is the law of the land. Some way must be found to make the Court realize that it is there for the purpose of serving the people of the United States and not being their dictatorial master.

I realize that this is not an easy task and one which will be violently opposed by the liberal element who always seem to find some excuse to coddle and protect the offender while closing their eyes to the injustice done to the general public.

Under my bill, members of the Supreme Court would have to be reconfirmed by the U.S. Senate every 10 years. In addition, a mandatory retirement at age 70 would be provided.

It seems to me that these are reasonable provisions inasmuch as under the present law there is no way that retirement can be forced, nor can members be brought to any formal accounting for their decisions. Members of Congress must periodically stand for reelection; the President is limited to two 4-year terms; but, under present laws, Supreme Court Justices are not limited except by death or voluntary retirement.

As stated previously, I have been very pleased with the response which my resolution brought forth in the closing days of the 90th Congress. I urge the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee to call hearings on this proposal and to go into the matter fully. I believe that it is deserving of mature consideration and the American people have clearly indicated that they desire some change in the present setup. It is significant, I believe, that the amendment process has been used on several occasions to change the constitutional provisions relative to the Presidency and also with reference

to the U.S. Senate. Therefore, the present constitutional provisions relating to the Supreme Court are not sacrosanct and should be weighed in terms of the public need.

We cannot stand idly by and see our great institutions changed beyond the point where positive recall can be effectuated.

The Court majority is clearly undermining the fabric of our society and we as Members of Congress have a duty to perform in order to protect the people we serve and the Nation of which we are a part.

DICTATORSHIP IN GREECE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1969

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, nearly 21 months have passed since the April 21, 1967, military coup by which a junta of army colonels seized power in Greece.

I trust that many of those who preferred to give the colonels the benefit of the doubt all these months will now come to a more severe judgment.

I especially hope that those who make the crucial decisions of American foreign policy have been making the painful and painfully necessary, reevaluation.

With each passing day, the Greek dictatorship is tightening its grip on every aspect of Greek life. The average Greek, whose spontaneity and love of political conversation is legendary, is now silent, afraid to talk freely to any but the most trusted friends. Purges take place ruthlessly in the military, the church, and the civil service, with obedience to the dictatorship the only test.

Those who pretend that the colonels came to power as constitutional reformers, a position regrettably advanced by our State Department, only delay the facing up to the hard, bitter realities. Those American businessmen who prefer to do business with a "stable" dictatorship should have on their conscience the bitter thought of 8 million human beings who have been deprived of rights even the most insensitive American businessman would consider fundamental.

The tragedy which American conservatives as well as American liberals must consider is that in Greece, "the vital center" of responsible liberals and conservatives is in desperate danger of being wiped out. The natural result would be a sharpened polarization into extreme right and extreme left. Neither American interests nor NATO interests can long avoid the dreadful consequences of such a development.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD several timely articles reviewing the situation in Greece:

[From News of Greece, November 1968]

THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE SPEAKS

(NOTE.—Text adopted by the Assembly of the Council of Europe on September 26, 1968.)

The Assembly,

1. Recalling the provisions of Article 3 of

the Statute of the Council of Europe, by virtue of which every member must accept the principles of the Rule of Law and of the enjoyment by all persons within its jurisdiction of human rights and fundamental freedoms;

2. Recalling that in Resolution 361 the Assembly decided (inter alia) in paragraph 8:

(1) to give close consideration to the constitution submitted to referendum and to the conditions under which the referendum itself would be held in order to ascertain their democratic character, and

(2) to make a recommendation by the spring of 1969 at the latest and earlier if necessary in relation to the suspension or expulsion of Greece from the Council of Europe if the promises of the regime to move towards an acceptable parliamentary democracy had not been respected;

3. Considering:

(a) that the derogation from the European Convention on Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms in Greece still persists;

(b) that many army officers, civil servants, professors and even judges have been dismissed on political grounds;

(c) that according to the opinion of juridical experts, which is shared by the Legal Affairs Committee of the Assembly, the draft constitution drawn up by the Greek Government does not conform to democratic principles;

(d) that the conditions in the months preceding the referendum on the draft constitution have made a free and democratic campaign impossible, that according to the declarations of the Greek Government the referendum will be held under martial law decreed on 21 April 1967, and that it cannot therefore be considered as a free expression of the popular will;

(e) that the Greek Government has made it clear, inter alia in the declaration made by the Prime Minister on 16 September 1968, that it has no intention, in the near future, of applying the articles of the constitution concerning parliamentary elections and human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of the press, the freedom of association, the freedom of assembly, and the freedom to form political parties;

4. Condemns the continued refusal of the Greek Government to reestablish human rights and fundamental freedoms and to ensure the rapid return to a democratic parliamentary regime;

5. Expresses its solidarity with the Greek people in its present plight and especially with those who are the victims of repressive measures;

6. Considers that respect for the Statute constitutes the very foundation of the Council of Europe's existence and must therefore admit of no exception;

7. Recalls Article 8 of the Statute of the Council of Europe by virtue of which "any member of the Council of Europe which has seriously violated Article 3 of its Statute may be suspended from its right of representation";

8. Calls for:

(a) The immediate return to a democratic and parliamentary system including the right of the Greek people to vote upon a democratic constitution;

(b) The immediate abolition of martial law, the full restoration of human rights and fundamental freedoms and an end to restrictions on political liberties;

(c) The organisation of parliamentary elections within six months under conditions which allow everyone to conduct a free and democratic campaign, including the announcement of the date of such elections in adequate time to enable political parties to prepare for them;

9. Expects all member governments of the Council of Europe to use their influence to secure the realisation of these aims and to show their willingness to give both moral and material support to a government committed

to the rapid establishment of a democratic and parliamentary system in Greece;

10. Decides:

(a) to follow attentively the development of the situation in Greece with regard to a return to parliamentary democracy and the restoration of human rights and fundamental freedoms;

(b) to consider, at its session in January 1969, in the light of a new report of its rapporteur concerning the progress made towards the restoration of democracy in Greece, whether to recommend to the Committee of Ministers to suspend the Greek Government from its right of representation in the Council of Europe, in accordance with Article 8 of the Statute.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sun-Times, Nov. 24, 1968]

GREECE: POLICE AND PROSPERITY
(By Christopher Janus)

George Papadopoulos wanted to be a doctor, but he flunked out of medical school. Now he is a dictator instead. But he still likes to think of himself as a doctor, of sorts, and he frequently refers to Greece as if the country were his patient.

The head of the Greek military junta used the analogy when I talked with him recently in the King George Hotel in Athens.

"The patient is sick and in the hospital," he told me.

I interrupted.

"Mr. Papadopoulos," I said, "you mean a prison hospital, don't you?"

That made him mad.

"How dare you!" he said. "Haven't you heard your secretary of defense say that America doesn't care what kind of government we have, so long as we are strong allies? What right do you have to come here and moralize about dictatorship when you know perfectly well your country is using Greece for its own strategic purposes?"

I wish I could have thought of a good answer.

A year ago, I had thought there was some hope for an early return to democratic government in Greece. But the resistance movement since then has suffered one setback after another—not the least of which was Defense Sec. Clark M. Clifford's shocking statement last May 17 before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The effect of that was really shattering.

Then there was the Russian invasion of Czechoslovakia, which the resistance people consider the greatest blow of all, and the emergence of a Russian naval force in the Mediterranean.

There was the election of Richard M. Nixon, who is expected to have a strongly NATO-oriented policy toward Greece, and of Spiro T. Agnew, who has publicly supported the junta. The Greek intellectuals would have much preferred Hubert H. Humphrey.

There was King Constantine's ludicrous and abortive attempt at a counter-coup, which forced him into exile in Rome. The general feeling was that a Boy Scout could have done better.

There was the Sept. 29 constitutional referendum—a farce, of course, but it gave the junta the appearance at least of a little more legality.

There was the psychological impact of Jacqueline Kennedy's marriage to Aristotle Onassis, which seemed to put yet another symbolic stamp of approval on the status quo.

There was the resumption of U.S. military aid, as recommended by Clifford.

A year ago, it seemed possible that the junta's heavy-handed bumbling and the deterioration of the Greek economy might force the military leaders to hold general elections in order to prevent a civil war.

But the economy now is prospering, due in part to relaxation of the sanctions that some countries had applied from abroad. The tourist trade has improved (although it is still

of maybe 25 to 30 per cent) and there has been a flow of foreign capital into Greece.

Thomas Pappas, head of Esso-Pappas, has been given the Coca-Cola franchise in Greece. Litton Industries of California is contracting with the junta for tourist and industrial developments that could amount to \$500,000,000, and Onassis is investing \$400,000,000 to build an aluminum and chemical plant outside Athens.

Over-all the economy is probably stronger now than it was before the junta's coup on April 21, 1967.

As for the junta, it's not bumbling any more. Greece today is a perfectly organized police state watched over by some 20,000 purged-loyal soldiers—including the tank genius Stylianos Patakos, whose Sherman's clank up at the drop of a leaflet—and a 200,000-member civilian counterespionage force.

This latter organization is the Greek Central Intelligence Agency, and it doesn't include 3,000 new taxicab drivers who were issued licenses just a short while ago. All the drivers took an oath they would work for the state and keep an ear cocked for subversive conversations.

According to the resistance, the Greek CIA was organized by and is paid for and currently run by the American CIA. Which might explain why Greece is so efficient these days.

From the day I arrived in Athens, I was followed everywhere by a little man with a mustache and glasses who was always carrying a briefcase and reading a newspaper. He'd be sitting there in the lobby of my hotel when I came down in the morning, and he'd be there when I went up at night.

I woke up at 2 o'clock one morning with a terrible cold. My doctor back home had recommended an antibiotic with a long name, but I couldn't remember it. So I phoned the doctor in Winnetka. He told me the name of the drug, and I wrote it down. The next morning, however, I couldn't read my own writing.

I went down to the lobby where the little man was sitting, and I said: "Look here, I'm desperately sick, and I know you were tapping my phone last night. Would you please check the recording, like a good fellow, and find out the name of the medicine I'm supposed to take?" Within the hour, I found it written on a slip of paper in my mailbox.

As for the resistance, I was told it has about 50,000 to 60,000 people in it now, in Greece and abroad. They're organized in basic groups of three—so if anybody is caught he can only inform on two other persons. The leader of course is Andreas Papandreu, head of the Center Union Party, who is living now in Sweden.

Andy is an old friend, and I spent several days with him in Stockholm after leaving Greece. He was very bitter about the American CIA, whose influence he learned much about when he was in office himself, and he scoffed at the idea of our backing the junta to strengthen NATO.

That's supposed to be realistic, he said, but actually it's not. The purges may have made the army a reliable internal police force, he said, but hundreds of the very best officers have been retired, and this has seriously weakened Greece's military posture within NATO.

He also had a warning for the businessmen who are signing all those palmy contracts with the junta. He said: "One of the first things we're going to do, when we're in power, is review all contracts—starting with the contract Mr. Pappas has with Esso Standard. We'll review the contract of Olympic Airways. And we're certainly going to examine everything that Litton Industries has done."

The resistance has very little money and almost no arms. Papandreu said the main strategy now is to work within the NATO human relations committee, exhorting the European members to call for Greece's expulsion from NATO for fundamental violations of its agreement with the committee.

The Europeans are much more sensitive to these violations than we are. If they should make expulsion noises, it's hoped that the United States would then put pressure on Greece to hold elections.

"One thing we need is a rallying point," said Papandreu. So a secondary strategy is to form a government in exile.

Papandreu said he would be happy to serve in such a government headed by Constantine Caramanlis, the former prime minister, and this would certainly be a very strong alliance—bringing together the left and right wings in common opposition to the junta.

But the establishment of a government in exile is an extremely complicated affair. For one thing, you have to be recognized by somebody. And even Sweden so far has been unwilling to do this, feeling that there is not enough active resistance inside Greece to justify such a move.

Papandreu has been criticized for making a deal with a Greek Communist now in exile in Rome. But he told me the only deal was to work together to overthrow the junta and have free elections. "I made no commitments beyond that," said Papandreu. And he added:

"I am not for Russian communism. I am not for Chinese communism. I am against dictators. I am a liberal. But I have to say I would make a deal with anybody to overthrow the junta. The only thing is, I will make absolutely no commitments to anybody I deal with—except, of course, for the promise of free elections open to all parties."

It was my impression that Papandreu is not very hopeful of success at the present time. But he is determined to prevail in the long run, and I know he will never give up.

It's ironic, and a bit sad, that many resistance leaders at the moment see the new Mrs. Onassis as their brightest hope.

I think the marriage will work, and I think Onassis will be a very good husband. This man is so sensitive to women. He sounds like a Cleo gangster when you're talking business with him, but the moment there's a woman with him he's a different kind of man. He's gentle, he's courteous, he's most considerate. He'll look after Jackie, and I think he'll make her happy.

Onassis of course is a practical man—"I'm just a businessman," he's always saying—and like most Europeans he has no concept of charity or philanthropy. But I think Jackie will have a great influence.

There's been talk of offering Onassis some kind of post with the rank, say, of president. More a title than anything else, Jackie then would be first lady of Greece, which would be a great public relations coup for the junta.

With all his business connections, I don't really think Onassis can afford to be president of a dictatorship. And I don't think Jackie would go along with it, unless there were honest elections at least. But it's interesting to speculate on the rivalry there would be between Jackie and Queen Anna Maria, if the monarchs returned.

The resistance of course hopes Jackie will try to imbue Onassis with some of the ideals of her late husband, and that Onassis in turn will use his influence to make the junta more responsive to democratic pressures.

This might seem unlikely, since Jackie herself has not appeared to be especially interested in politics. But something Papandreu told me could be significant in this connection.

He told me that Jackie donated \$500 to the resistance. He said she personally handed him a check for that amount when he was in this country.

WHAT WILL HAPPEN?

I saw King Constantine in Rome, and he indicated he expects to be back in Greece by next summer. He's given up any hope of

ousting the junta, I believe, and he'll go back with all his powers shorn. All he's holding out for now is a guarantee of elections, which would allow him to save face.

The next step probably will be to have elections, within the next year. And they'll be about as free and open as the constitutional referendum was. Papadopoulos will run against a few handpicked nonentities. He'll win, of course, and add still another coat of gloss to his mandate. Especially if the king returns.

I don't know. If Papadopoulos doesn't blunder, he could stay in power for a long time. The average Greek isn't hurting too much, after all: business is good, and he has lost only his freedom and dignity. There are only about 2,000 persons in jail now, officially, and only a few hundred people have been badly tortured.

I talked to three of those who were tortured—two former members of parliament, one of whom I doubt will live, and a 24-year-old who is a family friend and the daughter of a prominent Greek citizen.

The girl told me that anti-junta literature was found in her home. She was taken to the Dionysos Military Camp between Athens and Marathon, she said, and, while a motorcycle was kept running to muffle her screams, she was stripped naked by soldiers and beaten with a wire whip, among other indignities. And after several days of this, she was ready to tell them anything they wanted to hear. She was finally released, she said, after her father paid a ransom of \$25,000.

I discussed her case later with a lieutenant colonel I was having drinks with in the bar of the Grande Bretagne Hotel. An attractive, affable, well-educated fellow. He, too, knew the girl, and he conceded that her experience had been . . . well, unfortunate.

"But my God, man," I said. "It's uncivilized. Couldn't they at least have given her drugs instead? They've used the truth drugs on other people, and they work well enough." "Perhaps," said the officer. "But let's be realistic. It's all a question of survival, and the junta is fighting for its own life. What would happen to us, do you suppose, if the other side got in?"

He smiled and sipped his glass of ouzo. "Besides," he said, "sometimes a little torture is necessary to preserve civilization."

Well, I wish I could give you a better idea what things are like in Greece today. But as Hemingway once said after a brief trip through Franco's Spain, I was only there for a short while—and so, of course, I am in no position to report to you on the condition of the country.

[From the Progressive, January 1969]

LETTER FROM ATHENS: THE GREEK TRAGEDY
(By Sidney Lens)

(NOTE.—Sidney Lens, foreign affairs analyst and labor leader, made an extensive trip through the countries of Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean area last summer. His articles have appeared in *The Commonwealth*, *Liberation*, and *Harvard Business Review*, and his books include *"The Futile Crusade"* and *"Radicalism in America."*)

ATHENS.—No matter how rancid its dictatorship, any nation that lives in the American orbit must pay fealty to the word "democracy," if only to assuage public opinion in the United States. The totalitarian regime established by three army colonels in Greece after the surprise coup d'etat of April 21, 1967 is no exception to this rule, except perhaps that it is trying harder than most such dictatorships to measure up to our standards of hypocrisy. Every other word from the lips of Colonel (now Brigadier General) George Papadopoulos, the prime minister, is "democracy," yet his coup was directed in the first place at preventing a democratic election which the non-Communist left was almost sure to win.

Subsequently, as world public opinion condemned the illegal seizure of power and tourist boycotts were initiated against Greece, Papadopoulos and the two other colonels of his junta sugar-fed the populace a new constitution which they claimed to be the most democratic possible. Far from being democratic, however, it turned out to be a ruse for transforming a temporary dictatorship into a permanent one. It was adopted September 29, 1968, in a rigged election, held under martial law, which made free discussion impossible. Then, to compound the corruption, the circumscribed provisions on free speech, assembly, and the like were withheld from implementation and are still not in effect.

I attended the press conference where Papadopoulos unveiled his constitutional masterpiece. A short man, with receding forehead, his voice and mannerisms combine a hidden plea for understanding with an arrogant warning, "take it or else." He barely controlled his temper, for instance, when an American reporter asked whether the provision in the draft constitution which bars from politics all those who have ever tried to overthrow the Greek government also applies to the general and his so-called revolutionary officers.

What he was trying to do, Papadopoulos explained in a forty minute introduction, was to defend democracy from its enemies, introduce political stability, reduce the number of political parties, and take political conflict off the streets. No one had a copy of the precious document while he was talking—it was distributed afterwards—but a glance at its 138 articles indicated immediately how hollow was the pledge of freedom.

Communist and Communist-front parties like EDA (Union of the Democratic Left) are automatically excluded from functioning, and their members denied the right to run for office. But to assure that radical movements are not revived in disguised forms, a constitutional court he will appoint will have the authority to outlaw them.

Another provision—it was subsequently dropped—denied political privilege to anyone who has ever been a citizen of another country. This dagger was aimed at Andreas Papandreou, leader of the left wing of the Center Union Party and a hero of Greece's new left, who taught in the United States for many years and acquired U.S. citizenship before returning to Greece. Andreas was undoubtedly the promising figure in Greek politics, capable of mobilizing the youth, challenging the corrupt trade union leadership, and winning many Communists to his cause. But by this provision the dictatorship's most effective enemy was to be shunted to the sidelines.

Almost every substantive article begins with an obeisance to "democracy"—then cuts it to ribbons. "The press," says Article 14, "is free"—unless it "is patently rebellious, or aims at overthrowing the regime, or the existing social system, or is directed against the territorial integrity of the country, or creates defeatism, or constitutes an instigation to commit a crime of high treason." Under this melange of restrictions the press would be free to print only government communiques.

Article 18 upholds the right of assembly, then empowers the state to prohibit open air gatherings. Article 19 guarantees the right to form "associations"—but only if they do not oppose "the principles of the regime."

The same article legalizes strikes of working people, but not if they are for "political" reasons. In Greece everything that pertains to labor-management relations is political. No collective bargaining agreement may be signed without permission of the Minister of Labor, and the Minister, if he sees fit may amend, modify, or throw out any such pact. Every strike, therefore, implicitly challenges governmental authorities, and hence is "political."

The constitution, like the amnesty of December, 1967, and other measures, is being put forth to placate world opinion and at the same time try to forge some kind of popular base for the military regime. The Papadopoulos clan came to power, it should be noted, in an unorthodox manner, since it did not have the blessing of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. The CIA was not entirely innocent: From the bits of evidence available it was apparently plotting with the king and rightist generals to stage a coup d'etat a month or two later, providing the elections scheduled for May 28, 1967, were won by Papandreou. The three upstart colonels, however, beat the CIA, the king, and the generals to the punch and therein lies the origin of their difficulties.

The plotters had the support of only 300 officers—out of 8,000—and had almost no friends in the palace, among the police, or the public, which had scarcely heard of them before. Without a popular base they were forced to install military commissars in every government office, bank, or similar institution, and for a time assigned soldiers to ride in police cars to assure police cooperation. A recently released political prisoner told me that the police had treated him listlessly after he was picked up; the beatings and torture began only when military officers took over the interrogation.

The junta's first actions were hardly meant to win friends or influence people. Some 7,000 political foes were arrested, and more than 2,000 of them were exiled to two iniquitous islands, Yiaros and Leros. Many hundreds of these were brutally tortured: Women had their fingers broken, men were given the water treatment, others were strung up with hands tied behind their backs and feet barely touching the ground.

Stories of these goings-on leaked into the world press and forced a number of investigations by Amnesty International and the Red Cross. Amnesty International interviewed sixteen people who said they had been maltreated, and it received similar testimony from relatives and attorneys of thirty-two others. The Red Cross reported that it had found no torture on Yiaros and Leros and only indecisive evidence in the city prisons because no one nearby had heard the prisoners crying out in pain.

Another measure taken to assure synthetic allegiance was to have every civil servant and those working in banks and national security plants fill out questionnaires certifying to their political purity. After listing names and addresses of parents, relatives, and friends, they had to assert that none of these had ever been in one of seventeen proscribed Communist or Communist-front organizations, including the EAM resistance group, which had universal support during World War II.

Secret police have been patrolling the universities, sitting in at meetings, and often ordering students out of libraries or faculty premises to keep them from "agitating" their associates. Military officers have taken over the administration of towns and provinces. Union congresses have been banned, meetings prohibited, the press censored, political parties disbanded. To "save democracy," in other words, the colonels destroyed it.

As Greeks at home were terrorized into submission, millions abroad were alienated to the point where they demanded their governments take measures to isolate the police state. Parliaments of Italy, Holland, and Belgium officially condemned the Papadopoulos dictatorship; the Scandinavian countries brought charges against it before the European Court of Human Rights; Germany cancelled promised military aid; the British government publicly denounced the practice of torture. Even the United States, which undoubtedly would like to kiss and make up, first withheld and then recently approved—in the name of NATO—U.S. shipments of heavy war materiel. U.S. officials quietly pleaded with the junta to give itself a face-

lifting by adding better known figures to a cabinet that is patently amateurish, and moving toward some kind of "elections." Washington found itself in the unpleasant situation of having spent three and a half billion dollars over two decades to "preserve Greek democracy" against "totalitarianism" only to sire an obviously totalitarian regime, which it has now tacitly approved.

Many dictatorships can disregard worldwide pressures, particularly if they have a great power as protector. But Papadopoulos, who as a young cadet boasted he would be the Benito Mussolini of Greece, is not in this favored position, and his economy is much more vulnerable than that of most states. Greece imports almost three times as much as it exports, leaving a trade deficit each year of about \$700 million—made up by tourism, remittances from the 300,000 Greeks working in Western Europe, shipping, foreign investments, and foreign loans. Tourism was much reduced last year and is plunging still further this year. Loans and investments are increasingly hard to come by.

The effect of such measures, as well as hoarding of money within the country, has resulted in a serious slump in the economy. The regime boasts that it has balanced the budget—shades of Herbert Hoover—but the growth rate of the economy is half what it was before. Unemployment has risen from seven to ten per cent of the labor force (an underground paper says fifteen per cent). Industry, which climbed by fifteen per cent in the year before the coup d'état, stagnated in 1967, showing a rise of only one per cent.

Under the circumstances the junta desperately needs to change its image. I met the man who has recently been entrusted with this monumental assignment, the director for press and information, Byron Stamatopoulos. Stamatopoulos is less canny than his boss Papadopoulos, but far more intelligent and sophisticated. A long-time social democrat whose specialty was haranguing Communism on radio, he now uses his considerable talents to twist words like "democracy" and "freedom" into bizarre meanings that bring to mind George Orwell's look ahead to 1984.

Medium-sized, in his forties, hair turning iron-gray, Stamatopoulos is an imposing figure who fields questions adroitly. Yes, it is true the junta "suspended" civil servants from their posts, but the number is 1,200, not 3,000, and they are under investigation rather than discharged. Was he still a socialist? Yes. The officers with whom he works are not, of course, but by bringing democracy to Greece they are furthering the aims of socialism. Is he for nationalizing the means of production and economic planning? On that subject, he replied, it would be better to talk to one of the planning people, a certain Mr. Thanos. What are the achievements of the military regime? The government, he said, had cancelled \$250 million in debts owed by the farmers, had raised their social security benefits, introduced economic stability, and eliminated all the corruption of the past, when it was necessary to "tip" every civil servant or minister with whom you did business. He did not mention the suppression of "Communism," thought in his weekly news conferences he talks about little else.

All of this makes a coherent public relations presentation; unfortunately it is considerably distorted. The figures on how many civil servants were discharged in the purge naturally cannot be verified—my own sources were newspapermen and the underground. Nonetheless, while previous regimes always added a few thousand cronies to the payroll when they took office, this is the first one to require non-Communist loyalty statements. Just an hour before interviewing Stamatopoulos, I had spoken with a government clerk who said he had signed the questionnaire, like many of his conferees, because "otherwise I couldn't hold my job."

The military clique has not only raised

its salaries handsomely but has arranged for \$11 million in low cost loans to build homes for many officers; they have been given free private telephones, automobiles, and many other prerequisites. If the old forms of corruption have receded, new ones have come to the fore.

The five-year plan put forth by the regime's economists is generally considered a paper exercise—first, because almost no one in the higher echelons believes in economic planning, and, second, because the plan's objectives depend on \$300 million a year of foreign investments, whereas they are currently coming in at a sixth of that amount. The cancellation of debts to the farmers is on the plus side, but similar measures were taken under George Papandreou and even under the Metaxas dictatorship before World War II. The boost in rural pensions is only a couple of dollars a month, hardly enough to make any difference.

Most important of all is the loss of freedom. Stamatopoulos claims that anyone can say what he pleases and that there is no censorship, but these are falsehoods. Certain newspapers have been sufficiently purged of "dangerous" personnel so that they do not have to be reviewed by official snoopers. Others are still subject to censorship after publication and may be seized if they are critical. Whether censorship is complete or partial, however, is unimportant, because every reporter or editor knows that if he challenges the regime he will be removed from his post, or, in extreme cases, imprisoned. Last January, the editor of *Ethnos* was placed under arrest for a few days. In April, the editor of a rightist organ, *Apogemati*, suffered the same fate, and in May was rearrested along with his publishers.

A student told me that when the first draft of the constitution was put up for discussion at his university, many youth boycotted the event because they knew that secret agents would be present and their scholarships put in jeopardy. A released political prisoner confided to me that he is "free" only in the sense that he is not in prison; his office has been closed, he is denied work, and he has been picked up for interrogation by the police on four occasions in the last few months. Political opponents who came to see me at a coffee house on Constitution Square switched from taxis to buses, walked through department stores, and took other James Bond precautions before meeting me.

The loss of freedom is tragic not only for its human consequences but for its inevitable economic results. Greece made moderate economic progress under conservative governments from 1952 to 1963, and then raised its gross national product by seven to eight per cent a year during the next few years under the New Dealish regime of the late Papandreou. The country was just at the point where it could have leaped beyond \$700 a year per capita income if it had been permitted to build a viable left and change its antiquated institutions.

The farmers still operate on a multistrip system, with patches of land scattered over the villages; they desperately need to unify their holdings as well as to fashion effective cooperatives. Rural per capita income is only \$380 a year, as against \$970 in the cities.

The Greek worker has been the victim of a glaring maldistribution of income: According to U.S. sources, the gross product of factories had been rising, until 1967, at the rate of ten per cent a year, but the rate of new jobs created is only two to three per cent. With legitimate unions this maldistribution might have been corrected, but the Greek confederation of labor (GSEE) has been run by a chameleon, Fotis Makris, who for many years enjoyed the confidence and received substantial financial aid from the old American Federation of Labor. He permitted the government to check off dues directly into the government till, doing it out to the

unions at the rate of about a million dollars a year. Obviously, any labor organization that became too militant was subject to having its funds cut off.

Thus, without free unions or strong rural movements, there was no counterweight to the rightists, the generals, or the palace. That was exactly what Andreas Papandreou was trying to rectify. As leader of the Center Union's left wing he had gained a strong base among the youth and had apparently influenced a group of young army officers to oppose reactionary generals who controlled the military. He was also trying, when the boom fell, to organize legitimate unionists within GSEE to challenge Makris.

Without a viable left, Greece undoubtedly would have stagnated anyway. Now that left must be forged in a clandestine struggle against the dictatorship. Six such groups are currently in the process of formation; the two most important ones are Papandreou's Democratic Defense and the Patriotic Front of the Communists, which is divided by the three-way schism in the Communist movement abroad.

No one can tell what will happen next. Many people in Greece had hoped that Robert Kennedy, if elected President, would alter U.S. policy, and exert a determined pressure against the dictatorship. More realistic Greeks, however, recognize that they will receive no support from anywhere unless they can mobilize their own people to do their own fighting. It is doubtful that a guerrilla-type war will break out, but the students seem to be catching a second wind and there is some clandestine organization among workers. For all his dictatorial apparatus, Papadopoulos' hold on the population is so tenuous that any event which catapults these forces into motion can also topple him from power.

[From the San Jose (Calif.) Mercury and News, Dec. 14, 1968]

JUNTA STAMPS OUT LIBERALS: STERN NEW POLICE MEASURES REGIMENT GREEK CAMPUSES

(By Colin Chapman)

LONDON.—The Greek junta is taking stiffer measures against liberal-minded students in the universities, including the establishment of "police" squads in most colleges. A new breed of security guards will replace janitors and hall porters.

Reliable reports from Greece indicate that these "guards" have been chasing students through college campuses and arresting "troublemakers and non-students."

The Greek junta is determined to restore conservative measures to education. Step by step, the government has swept away the important provisions of the education reform bill, which had promised to give Greek schools and colleges a badly needed transfusion.

In the past few months, compulsory school attendance has been reduced from nine to six years, hot meals have been abolished, and, on orders of education "specialist" squadron leader Papanicolaou, obsolete textbooks have been brought back into use.

So far it is estimated that 50 professors, 80 secondary school teachers and 340 primary teachers have lost their jobs following the junta's attempts to annihilate protests and opposition. They are left without pensions and private schools are not allowed to employ them, although there are grave staff shortages.

What is worse, they have no chance to refute accusations made against them since not only are appeals excluded but the very accusations are kept secret by the authorities.

Law 40, article four exempts 10 per cent of the students from entrance examinations, allowing them to be admitted on the strength

of an "excellent moral record." Those who are admitted are suspected of being quietly trained as security men or to act as denouncers of their fellow students.

Article 17, paragraph four, of the new constitution provides for the appointment of a government commissioner, whose function is to be defined by law. Thus the inviolability of universities will be a thing of the past.

As if all these measures were not sufficient to guarantee the "healthy, disciplined moral" functioning of the universities, the new government did not omit to exclude from education the so-called "dangerous elements." The sifting that took place at last year's entrance examinations was achieved in four stages, and is strongly reminiscent of Stalinist techniques.

Free, public canteens were perhaps the greatest innovation for primary schools in rural areas, comprising nearly half the primary school population. Children had milk or chocolate for breakfast, and a hot mid-day meal which constituted not only a financial relief for the parents but also had another practical and salutary effect. Children, mainly from the mountains where communications are more or less non-existent and where there is a two-hour walk to school, had become used to a snack of bread and olives before the meals were introduced and there was little contact with fellow pupils.

The only excuse so far given for dropping the new system is that the schools were transformed into galleys and that the new government thought it wiser to help finance poor parents directly. These reforms are still awaited.

The education reform bill also provided for the development of technical education, for decentralization of higher education by creating new university units in Crete, Patrae and Ioannina and an increase in scholarship in Greece and abroad.

New textbooks were issued and "Demotiki," the popular language, was admitted for use in the schools. It has since been rejected.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Dec. 9, 1968]

HONORED GREEK TO STAND TRIAL
(By Alfred Friendly)

The Greek military government appears determined to bring to trial on charges of high treason a retired lieutenant general, much decorated for his services against the Communists during the Greek Civil War.

The defendant, by far the highest-ranking person to be so accused by the Greek junta, is 70-year-old Archimedes Argyropoulos. He was arrested last June and has been imprisoned, virtually incommunicado, ever since. He suffered a heart attack in October and his court-martial, originally set for mid-December, was postponed.

But according to his son, Dimitry, a UNESCO economist based in Paris, the trial is rescheduled for January.

The basis of the charge is a letter written by Lt. Gen. Argyropoulos on April 15, 1967, six days before the coup by which the junta came to power. According to the government's official spokesman, copies of the letter were discovered in the files of the crypto-Communist Party, EDA, and among the papers of Andreas Papandreaou, the left-leaning bete noire of the present regime, currently campaigning in exile for its overthrow.

According to Argyropoulos, however, the letter was written at his request to Phaedon Vegleris, then a professor of law at Athens University, with left-of-center political views. It urges popular organization to prevent what both men apparently feared would be developments tending to set aside the verdict of national elections that were then scheduled to take place in six weeks.

The document envisioned the possibility of violence and proposed the creation of "spe-

cial action groups which would be provided with special equipment with which to neutralize or destroy the effects of armored, mechanized units as well as the chemical weapons used by the opponent."

The avowed purpose of the retired General's "plan of action" was "to oppose, during the forthcoming elections, any use of force or attempt at fraud during these elections, or even an attempt to establish a dictatorship." It was to be organized against three possible contingencies: fraud by the right-wing political parties during the election, cancellation or postponement of the elections, or refusal of the rightists to abide by results unfavorable to them.

For the most part, Argyropoulos urged intensive organization of democratic groups to insist on the elections and the execution of their ultimate mandate. He conceded, however, that the concentrations of young militants "may result in personal clashes in the central streets and squares" against the forces of the antidemocratic oligarchy.

Discovery of the letter was announced by the junta spokesman last June to a gathering of the foreign press, which reacted with some skepticism.

This was occasioned by the fact that the purported new revelation came 15 months after the EDA files had been seized, that the government was preparing a major propaganda campaign for the national referendum a few months later, and that Argyropoulos was known to loathe Andreas Papandreaou and to have put an end to his long collaboration with Andreas's father and centrist political leader the late George Papandreaou, on the very point of the father's failure to stop the son's dealing with far left elements.

Argyropoulos was arrested on June 20 and placed in solitary confinement. As far as is known, a letter he wrote the next day to the Ministry of Information, defending his "plan" as purely defensive against anticipated fraud or coercion by right-wing parties, has not been made public in Greece.

On a recent visit to Washington, the defendant's son emphasized that if his father's proposal had any treasonable aspects at all, they ran against the Greek government of that time, a point which the Greek Ambassador to the United States, Christian X. Palamas, also volunteered in an interview last week.

But the present government, the younger Argyropoulos argues, is scarcely in a position to try anyone for treason against the previous regime, having itself committed the ultimate in treason against it—overthrowing it by military force.

Lt. Gen. Argyropoulos served in Washington in 1952-53 as Greek representative on the NATO Standing Group. Earlier, as a brigade commander, he was wounded in battle against the Communists and hospitalized for six months. Later, as Chief of Staff of the First Army Group, he declared he was responsible for the strategic plans that brought the civil war to an end.

Among other decorations he received for his services during that period was the American Legion of Merit.

ANTHONY V. MARANINO

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1969

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, Anthony V. Maranino, an employee of the Federal Government for 20 years in New York, collapsed and died in Union Station on January 3 while on his way home after

participating in observances relating to the swearing-in of the 91st Congress.

Mr. Speaker, Anthony V. Maranino was not only my good personal friend of long standing, but more than that he was an uncommonly knowledgeable, industrious and dedicated Federal employee.

At the time of his death, Mr. Maranino held the title of Manager of Employee Labor Relations in the New York Regional Office of the Post Office, a position he filled with utter concern for the Government's interest and for the interest of his fellow postal workers. He was held in high esteem not only by those with whom he worked but by all who knew him. His untimely passing at the age of 49 leaves a void in the hearts of all of us, who will always remember him as a kindly, self-effacing gentleman and true friend.

Mr. Maranino was devoted to his family—his wife, Nell; his son, Anthony Jr.; and his daughter, Janice, all of whom must find comfort in the knowledge that Mr. Maranino led such an exemplary personal life, and though it was cut short, he leaves them a heritage of which they can all be proud, a legacy which finds but humble expression in the heartfelt sympathy of his legion of friends.

Mr. Speaker, the Post Office Department has lost a dedicated worker; Mr. Maranino's family has lost a wonderful, selfless father and husband; I have lost a friend; and I think we have all been rendered less rich by his passing.

SPACE DOWN-TO-EARTH GAINS
IMMEASURABLE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1969

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Edward C. Welsh, executive director of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, has over the years been an outstanding champion for our national space effort. Dr. Welsh's views on the importance of our space effort were recently printed in the November 18 issue of the Denver Post. In this article, Dr. Welsh clearly summarizes not only the direct scientific and technical accomplishments of the national space program, but emphasizes the many contributions that are being made to the everyday life of the American people by this effort. Dr. Welsh's thoughtful analysis does much to provide an accurate frame of reference of the importance of our national space effort.

The article follows:

IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT:
SPACE DOWN-TO-EARTH GAINS IMMEASURABLE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Edward C. Welsh, executive director of the National Aeronautics and Space Council since 1961, is considered one of the nation's most knowledgeable persons on the over-all aspects of the U.S. space program. In the following article, written for The Denver Post, he describes the importance of space research and development in

the U.S. effort to retain world leadership in technology.)

Why are we in space? What are the real benefits of the tremendous—and expensive—program?

The national space program has to be justified on the grounds that it benefits mankind and that it does so in great quantity at reasonable cost.

Of course, we all know that money spent on space activities is spent right here on earth, not out on the moon or on the planets. It is a day-to-day business which employs people, increases incomes and raises our standard of living.

There is, of course, more to it than that. While it is true that the space program makes the country richer not poorer, stronger not weaker, and healthier not sicker, it does a lot of other things too.

ELEVEN POINTS LISTED

In an attempt to capsule the most important benefits of the national space program, I have listed 11 points. The national space program:

Stimulates our production, employment and income.

Produces new goods and services.

Applies technology to communications, observation—and navigation.

Contributes to medicine, with new instrumentation and equipment.

Encourages private enterprise.

Vitalizes our educational system.

Adds significantly to our store of scientific knowledge.

Lifts to new heights the international prestige of the country.

Utilizes systems analysis to solve community problems.

Enables our country to lead the world in advanced technology.

Strengthens our national security.

I have heard it said that critics of the national space program generally live in the leisurely world of ignorance. I would add that few who have been informed and who understand what the program does for the country continue to oppose it.

NOT EITHER-OR

There are those, of course, who are trapped by the illogical proposition that if the money involved were not spent on space, it would automatically flow into projects in which they are more interested. They are the ones who refer to problems of health, housing, crime, air and water pollution, educational deficiencies, and other ills of our complex society and suggest it would be better if we invested our resources in those areas instead of in space technology and space exploration.

I do not agree. It is not an "either-or" situation. In my judgment, if this country is great—and I know it is—it has the will, the ability and the responsibility to handle both a vigorous space program and the social and economic problems which confront it.

In fact, our competence to solve the issues of the city is greater because of the space program. It is greater not only because of the improved technology and management experience which can be brought to bear on these problems, but it is also greater because the United States is wealthier as a result of the space program.

When I say that the space program increases our gross national product and increases our national income, I could have added that it also raises our standard of living and makes larger our tax revenues which can be devoted to public service. We are indeed wealthier, not poorer, because of the national space program.

Not only does our space program, through its strong support of basic and applied research, make us better equipped to cope with our massive socio-economic problems, but history suggests that this kind of expertise is not nurtured and developed automatically. There is no precedent for the de-

gree of support that the government has provided for research and development since the advent of the Space Age.

RESOURCES UNKNOWN

In the absence of such a challenge, we might have drifted fatally into the unenviable position of a formerly great nation.

Just as industrial research on earth has become a vital import of the nation's economy, so research in space itself offers a new and as yet untapped resource of vast and unpredictable dimensions.

Such a vacuum as exists on the moon or in space generally is ideal for materials research, for thin-film technology, and for welding research.

The potential of satellites to extract the maximum economic return from space has only begun to be appreciated and the potential of commercial return from this new environment has barely been defined.

I am sometimes troubled by those who attempt to measure the value of our national space program only by the number and the importance of the material benefits which can be clearly identified.

But I draw to your attention the fact we cannot weigh or measure or package or even put a dollar sign on the value of education, or better health for our population, or greater national security, or a healthy competitive enterprise system, or better conditions of human welfare, or increased chances for world peace.

Yet, even though they cannot be measured precisely, their values are so great as to make them priceless.

ARGENTINES PRAISE UNITED STATES AND ITS AMBASSADOR

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1969

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, it is generally felt in this country that the United States, despite its generosity and sacrifice in behalf of others, receives nothing from abroad except criticism and ingratitude. This is often the case, but it is not always the case. As evidence that it is not always so, I should like to place into the Record an address recently delivered by Jorge S. Oria, president of the Argentine Chamber of Commerce, in honor of Carter L. Burgess, our Ambassador in Buenos Aires:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE ARGENTINE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AT THE LUNCHEON GIVEN IN HONOR OF CARTER L. BURGESS, AMBASSADOR OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

GENTLEMEN: The luncheon we are giving today in honor of the American Ambassador, Carter L. Burgess, reflects the friendly feeling of our Chamber and its members toward his country and toward him personally. The American Ambassador has always been welcome in our institution, but there are two additional circumstances that contribute to lay emphasis on our sentiments. At this moment presidential elections are taking place which will influence the immediate future of the most powerful nation of the world. The Ambassador of that country in Argentina, with his important and distinguished public and private career, personifies ideas and sentiments which we share and embody. In his first speech made in our midst, Ambassador Burgess said that economic freedom and the possibility of freely setting up commercial and industrial enter-

prises contributed strongly to the progress of his country, and he compared this freedom to a football or polo match between teams formed by expert and well-trained players who abide by fair rules applied by equally honorable referees. That is precisely the concept of free enterprise based on the provisions of the Argentine Constitution which has invariably inspired this Chamber of Commerce. The Constitution could be summarized by saying that it allows anyone to set up an enterprise and nobody can prevent another from doing likewise. Perhaps this is nothing more than an extensive application of principles which in the political order have also been consolidated in the United States. The origin of these principles is to be found in the old Anglo-Saxon tradition: the aim is to win fairly without destroying the other playing team; otherwise, no game could be possible, and this would prove boring and suffocating.

These ideas have linked our country with the United States much more deeply than is generally believed. It should be pointed out, for it is not sufficiently known even in our own country, that General Manuel Belgrano, one of the most prominent and faithful men of the Revolution of May, translated Washington's Farewell Address into Spanish: When that translation was destroyed by fire with all his papers in the battle of Tacuari in 1811, he made another translation of the great document of the political history of the United States and advised his fellow countrymen to keep it in their pockets as a rule of supreme efficacy in their conduct.

If for a long time certain isolationist ideas of international character contained even in Washington's Farewell Address were strongly influential in the United States and in our own country, it is quite evident that the changes that occurred in the world since the XVIII century to date make it necessary in our time to make a reasonable and warranted revision. If Washington's moral views which our own patriots of 1810 recommended as essential rules are still fully in force, this is not true with respect to isolation, which is not conceivable today in the face of the steadily expanding ideologies which we consider incompatible with civilized life. These sentiments of isolation are not linked with social evolution towards standards of greater justice that we all accept as essentially contrary to policies of political, material, intellectual and moral oppression which we consider repulsive.

It is for this reason that we stand firmly by the United States which achieved the miracle in this century of financing the difficult programs of the New Deal, Fair Deal, New Frontier, and Great Society; they faced the greatest economic crisis in the history of mankind in the 1930's and they won in the three greatest wars in history, without this preventing them from cooperating in world reconstruction with contributions amounting to more than \$150 billion.

For this and other reasons we cannot be neutral in the face of the ideologic dichotomy which is shaking the world. I believe that the United States, through some of its most prominent politicians and leaders, wished to be neutral at certain moments in this century but could not be so.

Neutrality in the face of what we consider incompatible with civilized life does not imply neutrality but abdication. It is useless to allege the advantages of political opportunism which only results in absence from the international field. Neutrality implies a moral indifference which is not at all praiseworthy but a duplicity of conduct, not to say lack of courage, in confronting those who, with the pretext of saving a supposed freedom in the economic field, suppress it in the political field by imposing the vexatious rules of the most anachronistic despotism.

It is possible that in certain matters and problems there may occur occasional diver-

gences with the United States, as may be the case of any nation with another. But, happily, we Argentines, even though we may be relatively impoverished by almost a quarter of a century of governments that were too busy with internal conflicts, have never been a country of resentful citizens.

That is why I believe I am right in saying that nowhere else in Latin America is the United States more respected or more highly regarded than among us, and it is for this reason that we need not dwell on, much less magnify, possible divergences. Judging by an old rule whose existence justifies its being regarded as such, the harshness of complaints made against the United States varies inversely with the importance of the complaining country, although there may be exceptions to this rule, as to any other.

Permit me, Mr. Ambassador, to end this salutation with the immortal words uttered by Jefferson: "Those who will never risk their lives for freedom will surely lose their freedom without surely saving their lives; unless we prize something in life which is more precious than mere life, we renounce the human estate, that in our precarious world, intelligence and courage have proved to have greater survival value than hysterical fear; and that if we continue to place our trust in them, we are justified to disdain despair, encourage trial, and nourish hope."

Because it applied these principles which are also our own, your country, Mr. Ambassador, has fully justified Walt Whitman's brief but stirring phrase: "The United States themselves are essentially the greatest poem."

In view of the results of the American Elections which were uncertain until a few minutes ago, this is the best wish we can make today: May your country continue to be essentially the greatest poem.

AERONAUTICS: SPACE COORDINATION

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 8, 1969

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in the spectacular developments surrounding the country's aeronautics and space activities, the operating agencies receive the largest share of public attention—and this is as it should be. However, the Government's aeronautics and space efforts are sizable and are growing in their complexity. The various departments and agencies involved in aeronautics and space need a coordinating point to focus the efforts and to give

the country the most efficient return for the resources invested.

Congress, in its wisdom, approved the establishment of the National Aeronautics and Space Council to coordinate the aeronautics and space activities of the Federal Government. With a small staff of experts, the Council has carried out its assigned tasks with great effectiveness and with little fanfare.

The following article from *Space/Aeronautics* of December 1968 pays fitting tribute to the valuable work of the Council and commends a continuation of its activities to the Nixon administration:

POINT OF VIEW: THE ODD COUPLE

(By Michael Getler)

The National Aeronautics and Space Council (NASC) has never quite made it as a household word around the country. But then neither had Spiro T. Agnew, at least until very recently.

It is somewhat fitting, therefore, that along with Mr. Agnew's rather sudden emergence into public notoriety has come the chairmanship of NASC, a post now occupied by Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey and before him by Lyndon B. Johnson.

Humphrey and Johnson are both veteran space enthusiasts, and both made very active leaders of what has come to be known as the "Spare Council." Agnew, on the other hand, has been a county executive and a Governor and has had very little to say about less earthy matters. The question now is, What will Mr. Agnew, as the Council's new chairman under law, or more precisely, what will Mr. Nixon, as his boss, do with this small and relatively obscure portion of the executive branch?

The question is of more than passing interest to the entire aerospace community when one understands what the Council has meant to the U.S. space program during the last seven years and also what almost happened to it under the last Republican Administration.

The Council was formed in October 1958, a year after the first beeps from Sputnik 1 pushed us grudgingly into the space age. It came as part of the act of Congress that transformed the venerable National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (NACA) into the National Aeronautics and Space Administration—the new agency that hopefully would muster our response and save our pride, among other things.

The Council was designed to assist and advise the President on space affairs in those rather frantic and uncertain days; to help sort out the right programs and roles for NASA, the Pentagon, and AEC. It was to exist at two levels. A top policy group made up of the Secretaries of Defense and State, the AEC Chairman, and the NASA Administrator, would meet several times a year. Below them would be a small, full-time staff of

about two dozen people headed by an Executive Secretary.

The Space Act passed in the Eisenhower Administration, but it was mostly a product of two Democrats on Capitol Hill: then Senate Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson and House Speaker John W. McCormack. And Eisenhower, surrounded by advisors such as Defense Secretary Charles Wilson and Presidential Assistant Sherman Adams, who saw no more in Sputnik than "a basketball in space," was never very keen on the idea. As a result, he never called the Council into session, never staffed it, and in fact, tried unsuccessfully to abolish it. Nixon, of course, was Vice-President at the time.

It was not until 1961 and the Kennedy Administration that the Space Council became a working group and the law was modified to make the Vice-President its chairman. Since then, the Council's role has been pivotal. It has played a key part in Presidential initiatives on large launch vehicle development, the Apollo program, and the Air Force's Manned Orbiting Laboratory. It drafted guidelines which led to establishment of Comsat Corp. and the orbiting of nuclear power supplies.

Most important, NASC, un beholden to Congress or NASA or the Pentagon, remains about the only place in town where the President can get a balanced picture of the national space program, something we still spend \$6 billion a year on even in these austere times.

For the public that is being asked to foot the bill, the Council, mostly through the efforts of its first and only Executive Secretary, Dr. Edward C. Welsh, also has taken on another somewhat unique role in government as the court explainer of a very tough subject. Dr. Welsh, in seven years, has probably made more speeches, cut more ribbons, answered more reporter's questions, and interpreted more space happenings, both ours and the Soviets', than any other public servant.

Whatever the objections of the Eisenhower Administration in the late '50s, things are different now. Space is clearly our concern, and an expensive one. The work of the Space Council over these years demands that it not only survive a change of Administrations, but that it be strengthened, particularly in its aeronautical aspects. A Senate investigation last year into the quagmire of multi-agency aeronautics R&D in this country recommended that NASC become the focal point for a much more comprehensive and better coordinated national effort in that area, too.

Next month, Dr. Welsh, along with scores of other Presidential appointees, will submit his resignation, as is customary when a new regime comes to power.

If that resignation is accepted, as seems likely, it is of the utmost importance that he be replaced with a man of similar credentials, and that Vice-President-elect Agnew bring to the Council the same sense of concern that marked his two predecessors.

SENATE—Thursday, January 9, 1969

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Dr. Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Before the mountains were brought forth, or ever, Thou hadst formed the earth and the world, even from everlasting to everlasting, Thou art God.—Psalm 90: 2.

O Lord, make us mindful of Thee this day. Invest us with a sense of the eternal. Spare us from being little souls wrapped

in the narrow confinement of our own selfish ways. But lift our eyes that we may behold the vision of that kingdom which is yet to be, the ruler of which is God, and the law of which is love.

As this day we render high honor to the intrepid voyagers in the vast ranges of Thy universe, make us explorers of the spirit and pioneers in a new order of brotherhood and peace. Equip the people of this land and their representatives here assembled with justice and righteousness, with wisdom and courage, with compassion and mercy, so as to be the servants of Thy purposes upon this earth.

Make us good enough, great enough, and strong enough for the age in which we live. Grant that goodness and mercy may follow us all our days that we may abide with Thee forever. In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, January 6, 1969, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.